



LIBRARY OF PRINCETON



OLD FINE SEMINARY

A

COMPANION

TO THE

BOOK OF GENESIS.

BY SAMUEL H. TURNER, D. D.

PROF. OF BIB. LIT. AND INTERP. OF SCRIP. IN THE THEOL. SEM. OF
THE PROT. EPIS. CHURCH, AND OF THE HEBREW LANG.
AND LIT. IN COLUM. COLL., NEW-YORK.

NEW-YORK & LONDON:

WILEY AND PUTNAM.

1841.

Entered according to an Act of Congress, in the year 1841, by
WILEY & PUTNAM,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern District of New-York.

P R E F A C E .

THE AUTHOR of the following work does not hesitate to acknowledge, that he offers it to the public with some solicitude. Apart from any personal considerations, which it would be affectation wholly to disclaim, there are others of a nature entirely different and vastly higher, which must make a strong impression on every writer who feels himself to be a moral and responsible agent. To comment on the sacred Scriptures is to interpret what God formerly revealed ; and therefore, the attempt should be made with due seriousness of mind, and suitable intellectual preparation. The expositor should possess a competent acquaintance with the principles and laws of interpretation, and also with the various facts which bear, either directly or indirectly, on the points to be illustrated. He should exercise a proper care and judgment in selecting from the sources of information, and in applying his knowledge to the obscurities which are to be cleared up, and the difficulties which are to be removed. Whether these requisitions shall appear to be met,

in any degree, in the subsequent pages, must be decided by the candid and intelligent examiner.

It may be proper to inform the reader, that it was not my intention to write a complete commentary on the book of Genesis, or, in any sense, a practical one. He need not therefore be surprised, if many things are here passed over which could not properly have been omitted in a more voluminous work, composed on a more extensive plan. The book now submitted to his inspection is intended as a companion to the first part of the Pentateuch. Far from being designed to lessen the importance or supersede the use of the inspired record, it does but accompany it as a servant and attendant. It is expected, therefore, that the reader will peruse it, and especially the Analysis, with the sacred volume open before him. Those who are acquainted with the original Hebrew, will, of course, prefer the fountain head of the truth. Others will find our admirable and generally accurate English translation among the very best and purest of the streams.

In the preparation both of the Analysis and the Notes, it has been my object to illustrate the book of Genesis by a constant reference to the original text, to other portions of Scripture, and to the best sources and aids of interpretation. In the hope, that, of those who may favor this volume with their attention, a considerable number will be competent to examine original authorities for themselves, it appeared to be due to that class of readers,

not to leave them without the means of determining on the correctness of the Author's representations. It is with this view, that I have occasionally introduced the authorities appealed to in their original language. It is hoped, however, that this will not deter the merely English reader from giving his attention to this work, as, in every instance, the original passages are accompanied by a translation, which, if not always literal, is yet sufficiently so to put him in possession of the writer's meaning. He will not object, because to one class of readers an advantage is afforded, of which it is his misfortune that he cannot avail himself.

It will be perceived that the literal sense of the words is adhered to, when there is no sufficient reason for adopting a figurative meaning. And when a passage is susceptible of more expositions than one, I have thought it most in accordance with that candor which should govern the expositor, not to limit the reader to that, which to my own mind may be most satisfactory: being well assured of this, that uniformity of opinion respecting the meaning of difficult passages of Scripture is not to be expected, both on account of the nature of the grounds whereon such passages ought to be interpreted, and the character and habits of the mind, varying, as they do, in consequence of different natural capacity, and also from the influence of education and incidental circumstances. If the data whereby to form a judgment respecting the

meaning of a passage have not appeared sufficiently clear or complete to settle the true and necessary sense, I have purposely avoided the expression of a decided opinion, being of nothing more strongly persuaded than of this, that an affectation of knowledge merely displays ignorance, and that an attempt to shroud in mystery what is clear, or to explain what is to us unintelligible, necessarily tends either to superstition or infidelity.

ERRATA.

- Page 15, line 4 from bottom, *for* *ln* *read* *in*.
— 68, — 11 from bottom, *for* 60 *read* 40.
— 72, — 7, *for* He *read* The.
— 83, — 1, *for* xi. *read* ix.
— 86, — 18, *for* 50 *read* 51.
— 102, — 7 from bottom, *for* her *read* his.
— 121, — 6 from bottom, *for* might *read* dignity.
— 131, — 7 from bottom, *for* idolatriæ *read* idololatriæ.
— 380, — 6, *for* שִׁילָה *read* שִׁילָה.
— 380, — 19, *for* adapted, *read* adopted.
— 385, — 16, *for* scarcely, *read* scarcely.

INTRODUCTION.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS derives its name from the history of the creation, in Greek *γένεσις*, with which it commences. The Jews designate the several books of the Pentateuch by the words with which they respectively begin; this book, therefore, is known by the name Bereshith, or Bereshith bara, בראשית ברא

Although the book is a part of the Pentateuch, and consequently not in all respects an entire work, it is still sufficiently complete in itself to admit of its being examined independently of the four books which succeed it. It may be divided generally into two portions. The first, chap. i—xi. 26, contains the principal events from the creation to the birth of Abraham, with genealogical lists of such of the ancestors of that patriarch as had preserved a due regard for religion and good morals. The second portion, comprehending the remainder of the book, furnishes a more detailed history of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, continuing to the death of Joseph; and in this portion the promises made to the patriarchs form everywhere the most conspicuous object.

After an account of the creation, of the original state of man, and of the fall, the first portion proceeds to relate the increase of irreligion and immorality, until, about the year 235, (iv. 26; v. 3, 6,) the true worshippers of the Deity were distinguished by the appellation “sons of God,” whilst those who disregarded the divine instructions and were led by merely human propensities, were called children “of men.”

Of the former class were the ancestors of Noah, who are consequently here introduced, (chap. v.) although the genealogy, like a long parenthesis, interrupts the close connexion between iv. 26 and vi. 1. For the same cause the extraordinary piety of Enoch and his translation are mentioned in v. 22 ss. The intermarriages or illicit union of these two classes of persons produced at last so general a corruption of religion and morals, that God destroyed by a flood all living creatures except Noah and his family, and the various animals which were preserved along with them in the ark. On account of the importance of this terrific event, it is related with more than usual particularity, (vi. 9—ix. 29.) This is followed by a genealogical and geographical account of settlements made in the world, (chap. x.) and then, (xi. 1—9,) the attempt to build the tower of Babel is related, which, as it gave rise to the dispersion, is intimately connected with the account of that event. The posterity of Shem, with whom religion and morals were preserved longest and in the greatest purity, are then introduced, (xi. 26.) down to the birth of Abraham.

The second portion of the book contains a more particular account of facts in which the Israelites were interested. As the family of Terah were idolatrous, (Josh. xxiv. 2; Gen. xxxi. 30, xxxv. 2,) Abraham is divinely called to go to Canaan, where a numerous posterity is promised him, and the settlement of his descendants through Isaac, after a residence of four hundred years in a foreign land: and also, that in his posterity "all nations should be blessed," (xii. 2, 3; xiii. 14—17; xv. 4, 5, 7, 13—18; xvii. 4—8; xviii. 18; xxii. 17, 18;) all which has in view the preservation of the knowledge of God and true religion, together with the coming of a spiritual deliverer to bring the blessing of salvation to mankind. These promises, which are repeated to Isaac, (xxvi. 1—5,) and to Jacob, (xxviii. 13—15,) are the principal point

on which every thing in this domestic history turns, the account of Joseph not excepted, as this includes the descent of Jacob's family into Egypt, where they became exceedingly numerous. Whatever is introduced in relation to other families and nations, has some bearing on the history of these patriarchs, or concerns some collateral branches of their families. See chap. xiv. 17 ss.; xxv. 1—4, 12—16; xxxvi.*

That the Pentateuch, and consequently the Book of Genesis as a constituent part of it, is the genuine work of Moses, is supported by the tradition of the whole church, both Jewish and Christian, which, with unanimous consent, ascribe it to this most extraordinary man, whose deeply religious character, natural talents, and profound and extensive learning, abundantly qualified him, under that inspiration of the Holy Spirit by which he was guided, to prepare the work, and to rule over the people of God, for whose use it was originally designed. In the earlier ages of the primitive Christian church, some of the Gnosticks and certain other heretics did indeed oppose the genuineness of the Pentateuch; but their efforts were directed chiefly against the divine origin of the law which it contained, and some of the historical narratives which it recounted, which appeared to them unworthy of the Divine Being.† The fathers considered the Pentateuch as the original work of Moses, restored through inspiration by Ezra, after its loss in consequence of the Babylonian captivity. The notion of this fabulous restoration originated with the Jews themselves.

The suspicion that the Pentateuch contains interpolations, may also be traced to the same source. Isaac Ben Jasus,

* JAHN'S Introduction, Part II. § 2.

† On this ground they are said in the Clementines to be false. See Homily II, chapters 41—44, 52, in Le Clerc's edition of Cotelierius, Ant. 1700, vol. I. p. 632, 634.

a Spanish Jew,* in the beginning of the eleventh century, suggested the idea that some portions of the Pentateuch were composed after the time of Moses. The 36th chapter of Genesis, for instance, he ascribed to the age of Jehoshaphat. Aben Ezra, who mentions this opinion with disapprobation, still admits that some interpolated passages occur. This learned writer is generally considered as the first who opposed the genuineness of the Pentateuch. Spinoza appeals to his authority, and endeavours thereby to support his own opinion, that the Pentateuch owes its present form to the labours of Ezra. *Tract. Theol. Polit. Cap. 8.* See *Handbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, by H. A. CH. HAEVERNICK, Erlangen, 1836, vol. I. p. 634—636.

It is unnecessary to mention various writers, who, in some form or other, have denied the genuineness of the Pentateuch, and consequently of the Book of Genesis. However great may have been the influence of their productions within a limited time and space, their objections have always been met by solid answers, and the genuineness of the Pentateuch as the authentic work of Moses has been vindicated to the satisfaction of the candid and intelligent. The reader will find a masterly discussion of this subject in JAHN'S Introduction, Part II. § 3—14. And in defending the genuineness of the five books of Moses, he comprehends also of course that of Genesis. For, as he remarks,† the events herein related are alluded to in the time of Joshua and in all the following ages, as well known equally with those in the remaining books; whence it may justly be inferred, that Genesis, from the time of Joshua downward, having been comprehended under the general titles of the Law, the Law of

* See WOLF'S *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, Tom. I. p. 339, No. 15, and p. 662, No. 1208.

† P. 190, 191.

Jehovah, the Law of Moses, and the Book of the Law of Moses, was attributed to Moses. There is the less room for doubting this, inasmuch as Genesis and the first chapters of Exodus form a necessary introduction to what follows,* and, on the contrary, in the remaining books of the Pentateuch, there are frequent references to the events narrated in Genesis and the first chapters of Exodus; so that both parts are closely connected in such a manner that neither would be perfect without the other. The Hebrews, degraded during their residence in Egypt so as to worship creatures, and, as had been foreseen by Moses, thenceforward continually prone to idolatry, needed the instruction given in Genesis and the former part of Exodus, respecting the nature of the deity whom they at Mount Sinai had acknowledged as their king, whose laws they had received, and to whom they proffered their reverence and gratitude for his mercies, by their Sabbaths and solemn feasts, by their sacrifices and first fruits, by their obedience to his laws, and by all their acts of homage and worship. If they had been unacquainted with this part of the Pentateuch, they must have been ignorant of the nature of the Deity whom they professed to worship; they could not at that remote period have known their king as God the Creator and Governor of the Universe; they could not have understood his frequently recurring titles, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; they could not have been able to

* The connexion of Genesis with the subsequent books, as introductory to their contents, and in some measure serving as an explanation and defence of the proceedings which they relate, will be evident upon an inspection of the following passages, all of which contain matter either alluded to in subsequent books, or else corresponding with some particulars therein developed. Chap. ii. 3; ix. 1—17, 20—27; xii. 1—3; xiii. 14—17; xv.; xvii.; xix. 30—38; xxi. 1—20; xxiv. 2—8; xxv. 1—6, 19—34; xxvii.; xxviii.; xxxv. 9—15; xxxvi. 6; xlvi. 1—7; xlviii.; xlix. 1, 7—13.

ascertain what was meant by the frequent references to the promises made to the patriarchs; and they must have been entirely in the dark, as to the number and nature of those wonderful works, which are so frequently mentioned in the remaining books of Moses. On all these subjects, oral tradition must, by the general lapse into idolatry, have become exceedingly depraved, if not totally obliterated, in the course of ages. The same writer, therefore, who, in his care for the information of the Hebrews even of remote periods, committed the Pentateuch to writing, would not have left instruction so necessary for that people, especially those of them who lived in later ages, as that contained in the book of Genesis and the former part of Exodus, to be supplied by oral tradition; neither is it credible that he did.'

But if the book of Genesis were written by Moses, agreeably to all ancient tradition and scriptural reference, inasmuch as the work contains narrations of events which took place long before the time of the author, the question arises, whence did he obtain his information? He must have derived his knowledge of the facts recorded either from immediate divine revelation, or from oral tradition, or from written documents or other monuments. The nature of many of the facts and the minuteness of the narration, render it quite improbable that such detailed accounts were communicated by immediate revelation. That all his knowledge should have been derived from oral tradition, appears morally impossible, when we consider the great number of names, of ages, of dates, and of minute events, which are recorded. It remains, then, that he must have obtained some information from written documents, coeval, or nearly so, with the events which they recorded, and composed by persons intimately acquainted with the subjects to which they relate. That these were few in number, appears

probable from the simple and uncultivated habits and the humble occupations of the Hebrews previously to their removal to Egypt, and from their oppressed and degraded state while there, all of which are unfavourable alike to literary pursuits and historical research. It is probable, therefore, that the history given by Moses in Genesis is derived principally from short memoranda and genealogical tables written by the patriarchs, or under their superintendence, and preserved by their posterity until the time of Moses, who made use of them, with additions from authentic tradition or existing monuments, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and thus prepared his work. Indeed, it is not improbable that the Hebrew legislator introduced some patriarchal narrations into his book with little or no alteration. The existence of written documents anterior to the time of Moses is unquestionable.* The authority of the book of Job, (xix. 23, 24,) and the late Egyptian disclosures, place this beyond a doubt. And it is difficult to think that documents were not used in preparing such narratives as that of Joseph, and some parts of the history of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. It is remarked by EWALD, in his work on the composition of Genesis, respecting the

* The subject of the early use of writing in reference to its bearing on the antiquity and genuineness of the Pentateuch, is carefully investigated by DR. E. W. HENGSTENBERG, in his work on the authenticity of the Pentateuch (*Die Authentie des Pentateuches*,) vol. I. p. 415-502, Berlin, 1836. As I shall hereafter refer to this work, it may be well to state, that it is the second part of the author's contributions towards an introduction to the Old Testament, of which his work on the Authenticity of Daniel and the Integrity of Zechariah constitute the first, and was published at Berlin, 1831. His Christology of the Old Testament has been translated by Professor Keith of Alexandria, and was published in three 8vo. volumes, the first at Alexandria, D. C. in 1836, and the remaining two at Washington, D. C. in 1839. This work ought to be in the hands of every student of theology.

narrative of the flood,* that, although indeed it might have been abbreviated and some collateral circumstances omitted, yet the writer evidently intends to show the divine agency even in the details, that he is under the influence of strong feeling, and describes the tragic event with minuteness and particularity, as if he had himself been an eye-witness. This is, as he adds, strikingly characteristic of Hebrew history, and is by no means confined to the account of the flood, but pervades the whole book of Genesis. The artist draws from the life, and delineates the vivid scene with all the freshness of nature and reality. It is not to be questioned, that this might be done by a writer who lived long after the facts related; but the opinion, that Moses employed certain patriarchal accounts composed by some one who had himself beheld the scene related, or else had heard it from an eye-witness, is probable, to say the least. On such a theory, the credibility, historic accuracy, and inspired authority of the book, derive additional strength: for the original author becomes an eye-witness, or either contemporaneous or nearly so with the facts related; and some of the facts are of such a nature that they could have been derived only from immediate revelation; and the whole being compiled by an inspired writer, have received the sanction of the Holy Spirit in an equal degree with his original productions.†

* *Die Komposition der Genesis kritisch untersucht*, von DR. H. A. EWALD. Braunschweig, 1823, p. 85.

† The reader will perhaps observe a striking verbal correspondence between some portions of this paragraph and parts of pages xxxiii and xxxiv of Professor BUSH's Introduction to his *Notes on the Book of Genesis*. As I do not wish it to be supposed that I would quote the Professor's language without the ordinary marks of acknowledgment, I think proper to state that the corresponding portions were written by me, and published as notes to Jahn's Introduction, translated by Professor Whittingham and myself. See p. 204, 205. The notes of Mr. Bush were published in 1839, Jahn's Introduction in 1827.

The book of Genesis then appears as the work of Moses, in preparing which, he was assisted by divine inspiration, suggesting what could not otherwise be known; by documents previously written; by standing monuments raised to commemorate historical or domestic facts; and by oral tradition handed down from early ages. On this last mentioned mode of conveying truth, the more reliance will be placed in proportion as we rightly consider the longevity of human life at the period in question, the vast importance of the topics transmitted, and the deep interest felt in their preservation.

The theory of pre-existent documents was first cautiously advanced by VITRINGA, who speaks of "scrolls and documents of the patriarchs preserved among the Israelites, and collected, digested, and arranged by Moses, and filled up wherein they were defective."* It was soon after proposed again by LE CENE†, and to a moderate extent, adopted by CALMET,‡ and Bishop GLEIG.§ ASTRUC was the first who attempted to mark out the various documents of which the book of Genesis consists. In his work on this subject,|| he supposed them to be twelve in number. He contended also

* "Has vero schedas et scrinia patrum, apud Israelitas conservata, Mosem opinamur collegisse, digessisse, ornasse, et ubi deficiebant compleretur, atque ex iis primum librorum suorum confecisse." *Observationes Sacrae*, Lib. 1. cap. iv. § 2, p. 36 ss. Ed. Francq. 1712.

† *Bible de Le Cene*, Tom. I. p. ix. Col. 2, and p. x. Col. 1 and 2, which, however, was not printed until 1741. See an able dissertation in *La Bible de Vence*, Tom. I. p. 286 ss. ed. 2.

‡ *Commentaire Littérale*, Tom. I. P. I. p. xiii.

§ Introduction to Stackhouse's *History of the Bible*. See also Horne's Introduction, vol. I. p. 54, 55, 6th edition. A list of writers by whom this opinion has been supported may be seen, with accurate references, in HOLDEN on the Fall, chap. II. p. 32, 33.

|| *Conjectures sur les memoires originaux dont il paroît que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de Genese*. Paris, 1753, 8vo.

that the first chapters of Exodus were likewise derived from them. This, however, no judicious person will allow. EICHORN, in his Introduction,* modified this hypothesis so as to limit the number of primitive documents to two, the one remarkable for using the term Jehovah as the name of God, while the other employs Elohim. Whatever is not derived from these two, he considers as original with the author. ILGEN† makes the distinction of three documents, two of which employ the word Elohim, and the other Jehovah; one of the former approximating both in language and character to the latter. These hypotheses are all ingeniously devised, but not one of them has received universal approbation. Each system rests upon far-fetched and arbitrary assumptions, and supposes the collector of the documents to resemble its framer in views and dispositions. Other theories of the same sort might be contrived, and, in fact, a new one was proposed by KELLE,‡ in 1811–12, and yet none will be universally acceptable; and after all, if any one were capable of being established by more ingenious arguments than all the rest, the only advantage to be derived would be, that then the documents employed in preparing the book of Genesis might be enumerated.§ But such a designation of original documents incorporated into the book cannot

* Einleitung ins A. T. Theil II. § 416–427.

† In his *Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs*, 1798.

‡ In his *Vorurtheilsfreye Würdigung der Mosaischen Schriften*. The author afterwards retracted his views, in his work entitled, *Die heiligen Schriften in ihrer Urgestalt, Deutsch und mit neuen Anmerkungen*, von K. G. KELLE, Freyberg, 1817, where he maintains that Genesis consists of a single genuine work of Moses, much interpolated by the priests of the race of Ithamar, and takes great pains to separate the supposed interpolations from the original work. A refutation of his hypothesis may be seen in ROSENMUELLER's *Scholia*, p. 52 ss.

§ Jahn, p. 204, 205.

be made. Even Rosenmüller maintains the impossibility of pointing out any certain distinction between the several documents of which the book of Genesis is composed. This assertion he maintains at some length, examining the different criteria, showing their want of certainty, and proving the futility of all attempts to discover, after a lapse of 3,000 years, the precise nature and extent of the records used by Moses in the preparation of his work.

Before the authorship of the book of Genesis became a subject of discussion, numerous interpolations were supposed to be found in it; and this opinion was maintained by some writers of distinction, both Jewish and Christian. Afterwards the hypothesis of documents was advanced; and some of its advocates, not content with admitting the fact that Moses did really employ such written sources of historical truth, undertook to ascertain their number, to determine their commencing and terminating points, to settle their character, and to pass judgment on their style, demonstrating that Moses, the learned and gifted Hebrew legislator, could not so have written. The theory of documents prepared the way for that of fragments.* Phenomena on which that theory was supposed to be founded, appeared, it was thought, in many smaller sections, even of the supposed documents, and the book of Genesis was subdivided into a multitude of portions, the larger were reduced to smaller, connected parts to disjointed fragments. It would be useless to mention, and very idle to examine, all the alleged reasons for such a procedure. But the principal allegations, on the ground of which the book of Genesis has been said to consist of independent documents and disconnected fragments,

* The fragmentary character of the book of Genesis, and particularly of the former part of it, is maintained even by HERDER in his third letter on the study of Theology, *Briefe das Studium der Theologie betreffend*; Collected Works, Stutgard and Tübingen, vol. xiii. p. 41, 42.

must not be passed over without some notice. If the reader wishes any fuller discussion than what the following brief remarks afford, he will find a very able examination of the alleged difficulties in the work of Ewald, before referred to. Hävernicks, in his Introduction, Part I. § 112, has made use of this acute and learned writer's labours.

1. The inscriptions are thought to indicate different documents or fragments.

But one writer may well be supposed to prefix suitable inscriptions to the respective narratives, as they are related by him. Indeed, the use of וְהָיָה, occurring principally in Genesis, and, derived from this source perhaps, appearing in a few other books, rather agrees with the opinion of one author than several. I mean that the balance of probabilities is in favour of this view, rather than of the contrary. Certainty, in such matters, is not indeed to be expected; but any one who considers how natural it would be for an author to bring forward the subdivisions of his work with introductions suited to the particular topics of such subdivisions, will hardly find in these inscriptions much evidence of different documents. To show the usage of the orientals on this subject of inscriptions, I refer the reader to Ewald's work, p. 133, ss.

2. The isolated character of the parts is appealed to in support of the same theory. These are said to want connexion, and that harmony in the manner of representation which characterizes a single author.

If by this nothing more is meant than that several of the narrations which the book contains are introduced somewhat abruptly, and without much effort to prepare the reader's mind, it may be granted. And this accords with the ordinary manner of eastern writing, and harmonizes with the usual narrative style of Scripture; and it might be expected to characterize a work of so high antiquity as the

book of Genesis. Introductions of historical events by remarks of a somewhat general nature, which gradually lead the reader's mind from preceding to subsequent accounts by observations founded on a philosophical view of things, belonged neither to the age nor the country, and therefore it would be unreasonable to expect them.

3. The repetitions with which it is said the book abounds, is thought to prove its fragmentary character.

As repetitions in language are frequent in ancient, oriental, and Hebrew writings, so also are repetitions of subject. The speaker pours out the theme, with which his soul is full, in repeated bursts of feeling or exhibitions of fact. And not only the speaker, the principal agent, the *magna pars* in the transaction, but the author also who relates the facts, participates in the same emotions, and stamps them on his work. Thus it becomes the impress both of the author's and the agent's mind, and its repetitions only show its admirable conformity to nature. This characteristic of Hebrew history is by no means inconsistent with its well-known brevity. In general, its statements are short and compressed. The author directs his eye to his ultimate object, frequently passing over the intermediate portions, which he afterwards illustrates and amplifies. Thus, as might be expected, repetitions would arise, the natural result of an endeavour to fill up and complete the representation.

Repetitions occur, when the author, having thrown into the general narrative an account of some particular circumstance, wishes to mark its prominency above the rest, and therefore introduces a brief notice of this point, to which he attaches especial importance. The reader cannot fail to observe several such places in Genesis, as also in other books of the Old Testament. But such repetitions might be expected from one and the same author writing a continuous account, and are certainly no indications of a fragment-

ary character of his work. So also in passing over from one circumstance to another, it is not uncommon to repeat the conclusion of the preceding account. Thus the antecedent narrative is connected with the subsequent. Sometimes indeed a considerable part of what has already been related is again introduced,—it may be in language somewhat different,—in order to prepare the way for some new and perhaps striking circumstance, to the connexion of which with the account repeated, the author would particularly direct the attention of his reader. Or the repetition may be intended to recall to the reader's mind what had been before stated, the thread of the narrative having been broken off by certain intervening accounts.

For these and other causes, which will probably suggest themselves, repetitions, sometimes verbal and sometimes merely in substance, appear in the book of Genesis. But, as Ewald has shown by a full induction of particulars, they appear also in an equal degree in other historical books of the Old Testament, and not unfrequently in other oriental histories. Verbal repetitions occur also in the works of Homer. The inference therefore which has been so hastily and confidently drawn, that the book consists of various independent fragments or documents, is entirely unsupported by the facts.

4. It is said that different accounts of one and the same fact are found in the work. A publication, which, without unity of plan, is made up of fragments of several authors not contemporaneous, might be expected to contain narrations, which, in particular circumstances, or in the disposition or design of the whole, are contradictory. Such phenomena are alleged to occur in the book of Genesis. But this assertion has never been supported by sufficient evidence. That different etymological meanings of the same name are suggested, as in the cases of Noah, Esau, Reuben, Zebulon,

Joseph, and others, cannot be proved. The idea that such phenomena indicate various writers is a mere fiction. The plain solution is this: the one author employs the paronomasia, so favorite a figure with the Hebrews; he uses a term which corresponds in sound with that already employed, and which conveys an idea in harmony with its meaning, or with the circumstances of the occasion. Neither has it been proved that different narratives of the same fact are to be found in the book. The relation in the second chapter is not, as has often been said, an account independent of that contained in the first. New matter is introduced, preparatory to which a portion of what had been stated in the first is repeated in different language. Abraham's twofold denial of his wife, and the similar narrative of Isaac, may indeed excite our surprise; but they afford no proof of a repetition of the same identical fact. In this, as in most, if not all of the other alleged points of evidence, the identity of the accounts has been taken for granted, and of course the theory to be proved has been assumed. This may be produced as one among many illustrations of the *logical* character of that species of criticism for which our own age is distinguished. It is easier to appeal to some internal feeling beyond the understanding, than to establish plain declarations on palpable evidence.

The unity of the book of Genesis, and of its author, is shown from the uniform and steady progress of the narrative, from the beginning to the end, each part of the history following very naturally that which immediately precedes. They follow either as parts of the history absolutely necessary to its perfection, or else as collateral accounts, interesting to those for whom the book was originally intended, and illustrative of its more prominent portions. If the book be one connected history, and not disjointed fragments, it cannot have been merely arranged in chronological order from

previously existing accounts, by some compiler, who collected the documents into one whole, without making any alteration in the distinct narrations. The undoubted marks of unity, both of plan and object, which the book exhibits, are inconsistent with this theory; unless indeed it be limited by very important modifications. It is evidently the intention of the whole book, with the exception of those introductory portions which precede the history of Abraham, to give an account of the people of God, from their origin to their settlement in Egypt. In doing this, the writer, in the progress of his work, continually alludes to what had been before stated, sometimes in similar and sometimes in the very same language; and this language in several instances is peculiar to the book, and in others evidently original in it. Doubtless, as I have before said, he availed himself of documents and other sources of information previously existing, and, agreeably to Hebrew usage, he retained the very phraseology of these documents so far as was consistent with his one object; but, in doing this, he adapted these sources of information to his purpose, modifying their language as the necessity of the case might require. In this respect, the work is analogous in some measure to the books of Samuel and of Kings.

5. I come now to consider another supposed indication of the documentary or fragmentary character of the book of Genesis, the use of the divine names, to which not a few writers have appealed with unbounded confidence. For this reason, and an account of the interest and importance of the subject, the reader will bear with me, if I should be more diffuse than heretofore. The subject is important, and deserves careful consideration.

It is hardly possible to read the book of Genesis attentively without observing that the Deity is therein designated by different names, and that these names are used in a very

remarkable manner. Sometimes the term God (*Elohim*), occurs, sometimes Lord, (*Jehovah*), and sometimes both are united. In i. 1—ii. 3, God is invariably used; in ii. 4—iii. 24, Lord God, except in iii. 1, 3, 5, where the speaker is a different person from the author; in iv. except v. 25, where Eve is introduced speaking, Lord alone. The facts in relation to this point, which a careful perusal of the whole book exhibits, plainly show, that these terms are frequently employed in such a manner as could not have been the result of chance, or of a mere intention to relieve the mind of the reader by an agreeable variety. To ascertain the ground on which the sacred writer has ordinarily employed one or other of these words in denoting the Supreme Being, is therefore an inquiry of no little interest, and in its connexions and results it is one of great importance.

The following table, which shows the usage throughout the book of Genesis, will enable the reader to form some judgment on the question, whether the use of these terms is incidental, or has a view to any particular design. It is founded on tables given by DRECHSLER, p. 5—7, in his work on the unity and genuineness of Genesis.* He continues the list to Exodus xxiv. inclusive, and gives others, showing the usage in Judges and 2 Samuel, (p. 3—5,) from which it ap-

* *Die Einheit und Aechtheit der Genesis*, von DR. MORITZ DRECHSLER; Hamburg, 1838, 8vo. This volume has an intimate connexion with another, published by the author in the preceding year, in which he attacks the literary character of certain late writers in the province of Old Testament criticism, particularly Von Bohlen and Vatke. It is entitled "*Die Unwissenschaftlichkeit im Gebiete der Alttestamentlichen Kritik, belegt aus den Schriften neuerer Kritiker, besonders der Herren Von Bohlen und Vatke.*" Some notice of this book may be seen in the *New York Review*, No. III, January, 1838.—Drechsler remarks that the list of places in which the divine names occur as given by Ewald, in his work on the composition of Genesis, is not altogether to be relied on. Some inaccuracies and omissions in his own I have corrected and supplied in the following table.

pears that the Lord, יהוה, is much the most frequently employed. The combined term, Lord God, which Drechsler gives in the same columns with Lord and God, is here separated from both the others. It occurs only in the following texts: Gen. ii. 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22; iii. 1, 8 twice, 9, 13, 14, 21, 22, 23; ix. 26; xv. 2, 8. In xxiv. 3, 7, 12, 27, and 42, both terms do indeed appear, but only one is used as a name of the Deity, the other being connected with what follows, as, "the Lord, God of my master Abraham," as in xxvii. 20, "the Lord, thy God." Comp. xxviii. 21. All these places belong to that class in which the term Lord is employed. With the exception therefore of one place in the 9th chapter and two in the 15th, the connected use of the two terms is confined to the 2d and 3d chapters.

Lord, יהוה

God, אלהים or אל

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| i. 1, 2, 3, 4 twice, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 twice, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21 twice, 22, 24, 25 twice, 26, 27 twice, 28 twice, 29, 31. | |
| ii. 2, 3 twice. | |
| iii. 1, 3, 5. | |
| iv. 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 13, 15 twice, 16, 26. | iv. 25. |
| v. 29. | v. 1 twice, 22, 24 twice. |
| vi. 3, 5,* 6, 7, 8. | vi. 2, 4, 9, 11, 12, 13, 22. |
| vii. 1, 5, 16. | vii. 9, 16, |
| viii. 20, 21 twice. | viii. 1 twice, 15. |
| | ix. 1, 6, 8, 12, 16, 17, 27. |
| x. 9. | |
| xi. 5, 6, 8, 9 twice. | |
| xii. 1, 4, 7 twice, 8 twice, 17. | |
| xiii. 4, 10 twice, 13, 14, 18. | |
| xiv. 22. | xiv. 18, 19, 20, 22. |
| xv. 1, 4, 6, 7, 18. | |
| xvi. 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11 twice, 13. | xvi. 13. |

* Our English Translation and Cranmer's Bible have "God": but the original is Lord, יהוה, and this is followed in the Geneva version.

Lord, יהוה

- xvii. 1.
 xviii. 1, 13, 14, 17, 19 twice, 20, 22, 26, 33.
 xix. 13 twice, 14, 16, 24 twice, 27.
 xx. 18.
 xxi. 1 twice, 33.
 xxii. 11, 14 twice, 15, 16.
 xxiv. 1, 3, 7, 12, 21, 26, 27 twice, 31, 35, 40, 42, 44, 48 twice, 50, 51, 52, 56.
 xxv. 21 twice, 22, 23.
 xxvi. 2, 12, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29.
 xxvii. 7, 20, 27.
 xxviii. 13 twice, 16, 21.
 xxix. 31, 32, 33, 35.
 xxx. 24, 27, 30.
 xxxi. 3, 49.
 xxxii. 10, (Eng. Tr. 9.)
 xxxviii. 7 twice, 10.
 xxxix. 2, 3 twice, 5 twice, 21, 23 twice.
 xlix. 18.

God, אלהים or אל

- xvii. 1, 3, 9, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23.
 xix. 29 twice.
 xx. 3, 6, 11, 13, 17 twice.
 xxi. 2, 4, 6, 12, 17 thrice, 19, 20, 22, 23, 33.
 xxii. 1, 3, 8, 9, 12,
 xxiii. 6, (prince of God; Eng. Tr. mighty prince.)
 xxv. 11.
 xxvii. 23.
 xxviii. 3, 4, 12, 17, 19, (house of God; Eng. Tr. Bethel,) 20, 22.
 xxx. 2, 6, 8, (wrestlings of God,) 17, 18, 20, 22 twice, 23.
 xxxi. 7, 9, 11, 13, 16 twice, 24, 42, 50.
 xxxii. 2, 3, 29, 31, (Eng. Tr. 1, 2, 23, 30.)
 xxxiii. 5, 10, 11, 20.
 xxxv. 1 twice, 3, 5, 7 twice, 9, 10, 11 twice, 13, 15.
 xxxix. 9.
 xl. 8.
 xli. 16, 25, 28, 32 twice, 38, 39, 51, 52.
 xlii. 18, 28.
 xliii. 14, 29.
 xliv. 16.
 xlv. 5, 7, 8, 9.
 xlvi. 2, 3.
 xlviii. 3, 9, 11, 15, 20, 21.
 xlix. 25.
 l. 19, 20, 24, 25.

It is presumed that no one can carefully examine the usage exhibited in this table, without a disposition to consider, whether it be attributable to chance, or to some definite and assignable cause.

In assisting the reader to form a judgment on this point, I shall freely avail myself of the valuable labours of DRECHSLER and HENGSTENBERG,* occasionally, however, suggesting doubts of the certainty of the results to which they have arrived. For the history of the subject I am indebted entirely to the last mentioned author.

The first reference to the different use of the divine names in Genesis occurs in TERTULLIAN, in his treatise against Her-mogenes, cap. 3, Tom. II. p. 61, edit. Semler, (p. 234, edit. Rigalt.) It was observed also by AUGUSTIN, de Genesi ad literam, viii. 11. edit. Bened. Tom. III. p. 176; and also by CHRYSOSTOM, in his 14th Homily on Genesis, Opp. Tom. II. p. 119, Franc. (edit. Paris. 1636, p. 136; edit. Bened. Tom. IV. p. 108.) The two former writers ascribe the difference to design, but fruitlessly endeavour to account for it by considering the meaning of *κύριος*, or dominus. The latter imagines them to be equivalent in meaning, and used indifferently.

Among the Jewish writers of the middle ages, RABBI JEHUDAH HALLEVI,† of the 12th century, the author of the book Cosri, is distinguished for the striking and profound thoughts which he developes on this point.

"The plural form of the word Elohim," says this writer, "is illustrated by regarding it as opposed to idolators, who, personifying the powers of nature, apply the singular to each one, and the plural to all combined, without keeping in view

* The treatise of Hengstenberg may be found in his book before mentioned, vol. I. p. 181—414. It is entitled, "the divine names in the Pentateuch, die Gottesnamen im Pentateuch."

† R. J. the Levite. See Wolf, Tom. IV. p. 1022, No. 25.

a higher power from whom they all proceed. The term Elohim is in opposition to these. It is consequently the most general name of the Deity, designating him in reference to the fulness of his powers, without respect to personality, moral properties, or any particular connexion with men. Hence it follows, that where God has given witness of himself and is truly known, another name becomes connected with Elohim; and this is the name Jehovah, which belongs to the covenant people to whom God has revealed himself. The former term is general and common, the latter particular and proper. The one is unintelligible to all those to whom the development of the Divine Being which it bears along with it has not been made known; the other, inasmuch as it designates God according as he is known to all men, is therefore generally intelligible. The name Jehovah, expressive as it is of the inward nature of the Deity, is only to be comprehended where this glorious Being has, as it were, gone out of himself; where he has opened the chambers of his heart, and granted a look within, so that instead of a dark indefinite somewhat, of which nothing more is known or can be predicated, than that it is mighty and excellent beyond all other things, the most personal among all that are personal, the most clearly marked among all that are marked, comes forward." Far more correctly and with deeper penetration than those who in modern times consider the term Jehovah as designating the national God of the Jews, this writer understands it as the appellation of God as revealing himself, and consequently carries up its use to the origin of revelation itself, and therefore to the very beginning of the human race. "The being who revealed himself to Adam, was designated by Adam himself as Jehovah." It was in a much later period, when the Divine Being limited his revelations to Israel, that the name became peculiar to that people. "The meaning implied in

the word God, (אֱלֹהִים,) may be apprehended by a process of reasoning, because the understanding teaches us that the world has a ruler and director. But what is implied in the term Jehovah, (יְהוָה,) cannot be thus apprehended, but only by prophetic vision, by which the man becomes separated, as it were, from his own species, and approximates to that of angels. Another spirit enters into him; preceding doubts of his heart are dissipated; and his soul is filled with veneration and love for the one God, and rather than abandon them, he is willing to lay down his life." Cosri, Buxtorf's Translation, p. 256, ss.

MAIMONIDES, in his *More Nevochim*, Part I. chap. lxi. lxii. lxiii., in the edition in Hebrew, printed at Berlin in 1791, 4to, fol. 56—60, (ט-נב,) in Buxtorf's Translation, p. 106—115, and ABARBANEL, as cited by Buxtorf in his *Dissertation de nominibus Dei Hebraicis*, p. 266, § 39, do also take notice of the distinction of the names employed to designate the Deity, but with less penetration than this author.

The first writer, who made prominent the false exposition of the distinction in question, was the physician, ASTRUC, in his work before mentioned. Proceeding on the supposition that the alternate use of the divine names is not founded on any internal difference, a supposition which he never thought of proving, inasmuch as no one in his time questioned it, and, moreover, recognizing the truth, that such use could not be incidental, he attempted to explain it on external grounds. He maintained that Moses had composed the book of Genesis from various writings; two principal documents, distinguished by the exclusive use of Jehovah and Elohim, and also ten particular memoirs, the use of which, however, was limited to a very few portions of Genesis.

This publication, at the time of its appearance, attracted very little attention. We learn this from the reply which was made to it, five years afterwards, by H. SCHARBAU, Vin-

dicix Geneseos contra auctorem anonymum libri, conjectures sur le *Genèse*, which appeared in the *Miscellanea Lubecensia*, vol. I. Rost. 1758, p. 39—106. The author apologizes at length for having employed some of his leisure hours in refuting so very silly a system of conjectures, by appealing to La Croze, who condescended to write against Harduin's absurdities. He very correctly estimated the danger in Astruc's attempt, who, to support his theory respecting the names, made great use of the unnecessary repetitions, the disorder and confusion, and the contradictions, which the book was said to contain. He treated the doctor as an enemy of revelation. But for the main point, for the correct exposition of the facts, on the erroneous interpretation of which Astruc's theory was based, nothing was gained by the vindication.

The period had not arrived for this theory to make impression, and it soon appeared to be buried in oblivion. But the times changed; and the question, how an hypothesis agreed with the divine authority of the Scriptures, was no longer considered. Hence it was, that when EICHORN, in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, again advanced and set off this theory, it met with general acquiescence, and spread with extraordinary rapidity, so that few German scholars of any name were to be found who did not embrace it.

It would be tedious to enumerate the various writers who defended this hypothesis, or to point out the differences between Eichhorn, who maintained the theory of two documents, and his chief follower, ILGEN, who defended that of three, and the various modifications introduced by others. These points have been already sufficiently noted on p. 18. I proceed to take notice of those authors who opposed those views.

HASSE deserves here to be honourably mentioned, inas-

much as, in his *Entdeckungen im Felde der ältesten Erd- und Menschengeschichte* Th. 2, Halle, 1805, he attacks the very fundamental principle of the theory, and maintains, that the alternate use of the names is founded on an internal difference in the idea. But, in determining the meaning of the two names, his procedure is so arbitrary and strange, that an examination of his views would be labour without profit.*

VATER did not meddle with the groundwork of the theory. In opposing the hypothesis of documents, he took care not to make the change of the divine names useless for that of fragments, to which he was attached. The work of Vater referred to, is his *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, *Commentar über den Pentateuch*. In Part II. p. 16, he expresses his opinion, that "the author of the fragment of Exodus," which contains vi. 3, "was unacquainted with Genesis;" although, as Ewald says, in his work already noted, p. 9, "the representations and phraseology of the place are evidently drawn from it." To use the language of this writer, "this is to cut the complicated knot with the sword of violence." The theory in question has but little to fear from such attacks as that of Vater.

The first really important opposition is that which was made by SACK, in his treatise *de usu nominum Dei אלהים et יהוה* in libro *Geneseos*, in the *Commentationes ad theologiam historicam*, Bonn, 1821; with which ought to be compared the remarks in the same writer's *Apologetik*, p. 157 ss.

* In order that the reader may know that this remark of Hengstenberg is not made without good reason, it may be well to state, that Hasse maintains the extraordinary hypothesis, that the book of Genesis had in view the recommendation of agriculture. Jehovah consequently is properly the god of agriculture, and therefore favourable to agriculturists. Of course, he is so to the Hebrews, to whom he would show himself as the only God, triumphing over all others! Such irreverent and unfounded theories are certainly unworthy of examination.

The discussion, so far as regards the main principle, the determining of the general relation between Jehovah and Elohim, was brought back again by him to the point at which the author of the book *Cosiri* had left it; and further, the attempt was made, and frequently with success, to explain, in particular portions of *Genesis*, the use of the two names on the ground of their fundamental difference.

A second more important attack on the hypothesis of documents and fragments was undertaken by EWALD, in his critical examination of *Genesis*. The chief value of this work consists in the ability with which it contends against the supposed fragmentary character and disorder of the composition, its inscriptions, repetitions, variety of language, and seeming contradictions. In showing the internal connexion of *Genesis* and the mutual relation of its parts, Ewald has great merit. But his investigations respecting the interchange of the divine names are exceedingly defective, and far less valuable than those of Sack. He considers Elohim as the general and inferior name of the Deity, Jehovah as that of the national God of the Israelites. This view, which, without the necessary linguistic proof, is drawn merely from an induction of places taken from later historical books, although it contains some truth, is unsatisfactory.

After mentioning the unimportant productions of GRAMBERG* and STAEBELIN,† in reference to the theory opposed by Ewald, Hengstenberg takes notice of HARTMANN. This writer defends the fragmentary theory, but attaches very little importance to the interchange of the names, although, indeed, he acknowledges a real difference between them. He gives

* *Libri Geneseos secundum fontes rite dignoscendos adumbratio nova.* Leipz. 1828.

† *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Genesis.* Basel. 1829.

the result of his inquiries in these words: "When an author, without evident, definite cause, confines himself in a long section to the use of one name, whether it be Elohim or Jehovah, he shows a certain preference for it, and may therefore be regarded as a different writer from one who, in the same proportion, proceeds in a direction quite opposite." If now, *an evident, definite cause* can be shown, the conclusion of Hartmann falls to the ground.

Ewald's latest view, as we learn from the review of Stähelin in the *Studium und Criticum* for 1831, Heft 3, is as follows: "The name Jehovah, as that of the Mosaic national God, may have been first imparted to the people by Moses, and associated with the national worship. In the period anterior to that of Moses, God may have been known by a general name, as Elohim; or a historian may so designate him, in contradistinction to that of the Mosaic revelation. The first groundwork of the whole Pentateuch is formed by a writing, which, as far as Exod. vi. 2, always names God Elohim, according to the belief or tradition that the name Jehovah was first made known by Moses, and closely connected with the whole structure of Mosaic worship. Another writing is interwoven with this, which, less correct in the ancient application of terms, employs Jehovah, the Mosaic divine name, to designate the Deity in the patriarchal times, using also the term Elohim; and thus portions occur in which Elohim appears exclusively, which is not the case with respect to Jehovah, unless incidentally. Those documents have, with judicious connexion and thought, been incorporated by a later writer into one, so that Genesis, in its present state, appears as the well connected work of some individual."

But if the difference between Jehovah and Elohim was generally recognized by the people, how is it possible that two Israelites, the author of the second writing and the col-

lector, could commit so unfortunate a blunder as to employ the name of the national God in circumstances anterior to the national existence? They could not possibly have regarded it merely as the name of the national God. Another consideration, comprehending this idea, but not identical with it, will account for its use in periods before the time of Moses.

Hengstenberg very justly remarks, that it is of the greatest importance to determine the derivation, and hence to ascertain the fundamental meaning of the terms under consideration. He begins with Jehovah, and settles the previous question, whether the word is of foreign or of Hebrew origin. He investigates the Egyptian and Phœnician claims, and rejects them as inadmissible. The claim set up for a Chinese origin, and the derivation from Jovis, are hardly worthy of notice. The word is undoubtedly of Hebrew etymology.

The learned writer then proceeds to examine the correct punctuation of the word. In his opinion, the vowels in present use were taken from Adonai, and the original pronunciation was yahveh, יְהוֹה (or, יְהוָה,) making the regular future of הָיָה, and meaning *the existing*, literally, ‘he will exist.’ He considers Exod. iii. 14: “and God said unto Moses, I am what I am,” or; ‘I will be what I will be,’ אֲהֵיָה אֲשֶׁר אֲהֵיָה, as implying *immutability*. In the words of Augustin in loc.: “it is the name of unchangeableness. For all things that are mutable, cease to be what they were, and begin to be what they were not. Immutability is peculiar to essential truth. He has the property of existence to whom it is said, ‘thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed, but thou art the same.’ What is “I am that I am,” but ‘I am eternal’? What is “I am that I am,” but ‘I cannot be changed’?” ‘The existing,’ and ‘the unchanging,’

he considers as equivalent in meaning, and as conveying the sentiment of the text.

Like Hengstenberg, Drechsler also examines the signification of the two names, before he attempts to deduce any theory in reference to their use in the book of Genesis. In general views and results, those two scholars coincide. But the latter writer, proceeding, in his argument, from the same text in Exodus, comes to the conclusion, that Jehovah implies *capability in himself*. The words, "I will be what I will be," do not, he thinks, express the idea usually attached to them of immutability, but rather that of *unlimited freedom*. This, he maintains, accords with analogous usage, and refers to 2 Kings, viii. 1, "sojourn where thou wilt sojourn," גִּירָרִי בְּאֶשֶׁר תִּגְדָּרִי; also to 2 Sam. xv. 20, and Gen. xliii. 14, which are less to the point. He considers the declarations in Exod. xxxiii. 19, Rom. ix. 15, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy," as entirely parallel to the words in Exodus iii. 14. Independent action and independent being may be considered as necessarily connected. On this ground, and in as much as the word אֶהְיֶה 'I will be,' or 'I am,' is used instead of the whole expression, Drechsler concludes that the thought thereby conveyed, is that of independent being, p. 12.

This thought is so closely allied to that given by Hengstenberg, that the practical application of both, in reference to the use of the divine names in Genesis, coincides. To determine their comparative philological correctness, would be of little importance. The commonly received exposition, which asserts immutability of character, inasmuch as it accords with the simple meaning of the words, and comprehends the idea of independent volition and action, is here presumed to be the true interpretation. Unlimited freedom in the formation of plans, and also in their execution, is thus necessarily implied in the declaration under consideration.

The word Elohim is, in all probability, derived from a root, which, although lost in the Hebrew, is still retained in the Arabic language, عَلِي, عَلِي, which not only means 'to worship God,' but also 'to be astonished, amazed, struck with fear.' Thus it conveys the idea of holy reverence and terror, analogous to the language in Gen. xxxi. 42, 53, where God is called "the fear of Isaac," meaning doubtless the object of his most sacred awe. Comp. Isa. viii. 13, "let him, (Jehovah,) be your fear and your dread." Thus Elohim may be regarded as a general term for God, implying his glory and dignity, as Creator, preserver and governor of all things, and by consequence exhibiting him as the great being, whom all his creatures are to honour and reverence, at the very thought of whose unlimited power all the universe must tremble: the great and mighty God, in contradistinction to the feeble and inefficient creature.

Hengstenberg objects to the opinion, so anciently and frequently maintained, that the plural form implies plurality of persons. In that case, he thinks it could not be used of divine personages in the widest application, as of angels and supernatural beings, as it is in Ps. viii. 5; 1 Sam. xxviii. 13; and also of idols. But, without deciding in favour of the opinion referred to, it may be said, that whenever the term is so used, that original ground of the plural form might be lost sight of. This is the case in a multitude of words, as their meaning varies in proportion to the extensiveness of their application. And it is the case in English when we apply the word God to denote a false god, an *evil* being, although originally it implied *goodness*, as a characteristic necessarily belonging to the being so designated.

If it is clear, that the Pentateuch contains a revelation of God progressively advancing, until it terminates in a development of the complete theocracy; then, from the intimate connexion of name and thing, we may reasonably ex-

pect that the author, by the use of designed and carefully varied divine names, intended to note a real difference characteristic of the earlier and later periods. If Elohim be the more general, and Jehovah the more definite and profound name of the Deity, we might consequently expect to find, that the use of these terms varies, before the full establishment of the theocracy, in a different manner from what it does after. According as the subject is connected with the earlier or later period, in other words, as the analogy with the world in general or with the theocracy predominates, the name Jehovah or Elohim must be employed. As the name indicates character, the language in Ex. vi. 3, "by my name Jehovah," is equivalent to 'in my character as Jehovah.' The reference is not to the mere name, but to the thing designated. "You shall know that I am Jehovah, your God;" you shall know it by the wonderful deliverance from Egypt. Such a developement of divine power was never made to the patriarchs, and indeed, from the nature of the case, it could not have been. This text determines nothing respecting the age of the *term* Jehovah. It speaks of the *revelation of God as Jehovah*. Thus far the same being, who, in one respect, was Jehovah, in another has always been Elohim. Now, the great catastrophe approaches, by which Jehovah-Elohim becomes or displays himself as Jehovah.

Thus Hengstenberg. Drechsler also maintains that the use of the two names rests on grounds connected with the subject, and that the difference in such use observable in Genesis from that found in other books of the Old Testament, is not to be ascribed to mere arbitrariness on the part of the writer, but arises from its peculiar character of the contents, which bears an especial relation to one or other of the divine names, as either may be found to have been employed. He then remarks as follows.

“If, in order to discover the object which this varying usage has in view, we examine the other books of the Pentateuch, it will appear that the same usage prevails in these as is to be found in the later historical writings. In the first four chapters of Deuteronomy, in eighty-one instances where the Supreme Being is mentioned, the term Elohim occurs only seven times.

“Further, the important fact is not to be omitted, that, in other books besides Genesis, where the name Jehovah predominates, Elohim is used exclusively in sections of considerable length. This is the case in Jud. ix. and 2 Sam. ix. And, as might naturally be expected, instances of the contrary usage are also to be found.

“It has been stated that an examination of passages proves the word Jehovah to be much more frequently used than the other. This might have been expected, as it designates God as having revealed himself. And, inasmuch as the Israelitish people constituted the scene of his operations, their existence, and the condition of it, both civil and ecclesiastical, comprehending their institutions and whole manner of life, were the result of his revelations. Consequently the name Jehovah must have been all-important to the Israelites. It is unnecessary therefore to inquire under what circumstances this term would be employed, but when the other might or must be used.

“This general term, Elohim, referring to the Creator, is in contradistinction to the name Jehovah; which refers to him as having made a revelation of himself. See Deut. iv. 32—40: ‘For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth, and ask from the one side of heaven unto the other, whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it? Did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou

hast heard, and live? Or hath God assayed to go and take him a nation from the midst of another nation, by temptations, by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm, and by great terrors, according to all that Jehovah your God did for you in Egypt before your eyes? Unto thee it was shewed, that thou mightest know that Jehovah he is God; there is none else besides him. Out of heaven he made thee to hear his voice, that he might instruct thee: and upon earth he shewed thee his great fire; and thou heardest his words out of the midst of the fire. And because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them, and brought thee out in his sight with his mighty power out of Egypt; to drive out nations from before thee, greater and mightier than thou art, to bring thee in, to give thee their land for an inheritance, as it is this day. Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that Jehovah he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath: there is none else. Thou shalt keep therefore his statutes, and his commandments, which I command thee this day, that it may go well with thee, and with thy children after thee, and that thou mayest prolong thy days upon the earth, which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, for ever.' Compare also 1 Kings, xviii. 24: 'And call ye on the name of your gods, and I will call on the name of Jehovah: and the God that answereth by fire, let him be God. And all the people answered and said, It is well spoken.' In these and other cases, God, as he is in his nature, is distinguished from God as having revealed himself. Elsewhere this difference is not essential, and then the two expressions imply no contradistinction, and may be used indifferently, as is the case in many places." p. 9, 10, 17, 20.

The term Elohim, then, is the general designation of the glorious maker, preserver, and governor of the universe, the great and dreadful God, a proper estimate of whose attri-

butes must fill the mind of every intelligent creature with reverential awe, the more profound in proportion as those attributes are truly understood and appreciated. The other word, Jehovah, designating the same eternal and infinite being, has a particular bearing. God is contemplated as having a grand and ultimate object in view. To accomplish this, he displays himself with different degrees of clearness as a being without the possibility of change, and with infinite freedom of volition and of action. In this light he is Jehovah; and in this light, his revelations and actions towards his people are proper exhibitions of him as the unchangeable and the infinite.

If, now, a clearly marked difference of meaning in the terms themselves, and also a clearly marked difference of object on the part of the writer, are the general grounds of the varying usage under consideration, the gain to the truth as historically transmitted is considerable. The inference, which at one time was drawn without hesitation, namely, that the fact indicates different authors, is evidently unfounded. The same writer may have chosen different terms, as, in his judgment, the one or the other harmonized the better with the character of the accompanying contents.

But still the question arises, is this the invariable ground of the usage? Are there no cases where either term might have been employed without weakening the impression designed to be conveyed by the narrations in connexion with which one of them is used? I am compelled to express the opinion, that there are. It is manifest to me, that in several places either term might have been chosen, and, as it would seem, without affecting even in the slightest degree the influence of the connected portion on the mind of the reader. However true the principle laid down may be as the general ground of the usage, the two learned authors referred to appear to me occasionally to carry the application of it un-

warrantably far. They sometimes make the sacred writer scrupulously and minutely particular in the choice of his terms, at the expense of simplicity and nature. Jehovah and Elohim, which, although differing in primary meaning, do, it is allowed, designate the same God, may sometimes be used as proper names, without regard to their original or etymological meanings, just as Jesus and Christ are ordinarily used by Christians, and occasionally in the New Testament.

I proceed now to take a cursory view of the application of these terms respectively in some of the most important portions of the book of Genesis. This will afford me an occasion of illustrating the remark just made, and give the reader an opportunity of judging of its correctness.

Genesis commences with an account of the creation, and consequently Elohim is the more suitable word. At the period here referred to, God had not appeared as Jehovah, revealing himself to his creature. It is only in his general connexion with the whole universe that he is here brought forward as the Almighty, the creator of all, and consequently superior to all. The Hebrew, in speaking of the creation, could undoubtedly have used the term Jehovah to designate the creator, inasmuch as both this term and the other represented the same object to his mind. And hence we find it repeatedly thus employed, as in Ex. xx. 11; xxxi. 17; Ps. viii. 1; xxxiii. 6; civ. 16, 24; Isa. xlii. 5. But in the first introduction of an account of the creation, the author very judiciously places himself, as it were, in the very time of the act, and therefore mentions the Divine Maker under the name which is particularly appropriate to the subject. "The heavens declare the glory of God;" and it is "the law of Jehovah" which is said to be "perfect." Ps. xix. 1, 7.

Man, originally good, in the direction of all his powers to God, is the subject of what follows. Consequently Elohim

appears as Jehovah, thus making his connexion with man the subject of positive revelation. The combination of the two terms is to show that the same being is intended by both.

The supposition that the second chapter contains a second history of the creation different from the former comprised in the first chapter, is founded on a misapprehension of its meaning. It is not a history of the creation; it merely contains historical information introductory to what follows in the third chapter.

These brief observations sufficiently explain the ground of the usage in the second and third chapters. But for the reader's satisfaction, I add the following abridged remarks of Hengstenberg. 'Both names are here used, thus implying that the being designated by each is one, that the true Elohim is Jehovah, and that Jehovah is really Elohim. Sometimes the exclusive use of one followed by an exclusive use of the other, implies the same thing, as is the case in the book of Jonah. In the portion under consideration, the name Jehovah is that which is best adapted to the nature of the contents. The living God, revealing himself to his creatures, is now manifested. He appears as the affectionate guardian of men, the disposer of moral life, commanding and prohibiting, threatening punishment, and opening before the mind the restoration which shall be hereafter. If the author had had in view those only who had attained to a clear recognition of the connexion of Elohim and Jehovah, the latter term alone would have been sufficient. But, inasmuch as he rather aims first to intimate the grounds of the connexion of Jehovah and Elohim, the transition from the use of the latter term to that of the former alone would have been too rapid. He wished to avoid the misapprehension, which would be implied in the supposition, that the God who dealt so humanely with men might be a different

person from the creator of heaven and earth, a merely inferior God and mediator. He therefore here uses the two terms in connexion, in order that, in subsequent portions, when Jehovah or Elohim occurs alone, the reader may immediately recognize the truth that the one implies also the other.

The general character of these chapters requires the use of Jehovah. But, apart from this consideration, Elohim might have been used in particular places with equal propriety. It might have been said of God, as well as of the Lord God, "he had not caused it to rain upon the earth." But, as this notice is preparatory to the account afterwards to be related of the establishment of Paradise, it represents God's affectionate care for man in preparing him a residence even before he was called into existence. The same principle explains the usage elsewhere.

It follows from what has been said, that the use of the two terms in combination must be limited to the author. Consequently, we do not find it in the language ascribed to the serpent and the woman, because it would be inconsistent with the nature of the temptation, and also with such a state of mind as would give it consideration.

This view of the matter, as it accounts for the variable use of the names, destroys the hypothesis of particular documents, designated each by its own respective term.

Elohim has now appeared as Jehovah. This, therefore, becomes in the fourth chapter the predominant term. The other might, indeed, in most places have been used with propriety, but this is particularly appropriate, as the offerings of Cain and Abel were made to Jehovah. The use of Elohim in v. 25, "for God hath appointed me another seed," compared with that of Jehovah in v. 1, "I have gotten a man from the Lord," where the subject is the same, requires no laboured exposition. The author implies that

each term is equally expressive of the same Divine Being, "the giver of every good gift."

Both the writers before mentioned appear to be fanciful in assigning reasons for the difference in these two verses. Drechsler supposes that the choice of Elohim in v. 25, marks the opposition between God and man. "God replaces in the person of Seth, what Cain had attempted to destroy in that of Abel:" p. 86. Hengstenberg maintains that a different word from that used in the first verse marks the state of the mother's mind. "At the first birth, her consciousness of the divine presence and being is particularly vivid. By inflicting punishment, God had shown himself to be Jehovah; as Jehovah also is he recognized in the benefit. In the birth of her first son, Eve discovers a dear pledge of his favour. At that of Seth, this feeling is not a little qualified. She merely recognizes a general divine influence; and the naturalness of the event does not, as on the first occasion, appear to her entirely in the back ground." This inference, founded on such slight premises, will not be considered as receiving much support from the language of Leah, to which the author appeals, although he chooses to conclude that "the correctness of the exposition is consequently indubitable." p. 320. He gives no references, but I presume he alludes to the language of xxix. 31-35, compared with that of xxx. 17, 20.

The indiscriminate application of a true theory, without a due regard to exceptions and limitations, by which every theory on such a subject must be modified, appears also in the remarks of one at least, if not both of these writers, on the next portion of the book of Genesis.

'In the whole account of the flood,' says Drechsler, 'Elohim and Jehovah are both used, the former term, however, greatly preponderating. And this is very proper, as the subject relates to mankind in general, and not particularly to

God's church. A second creation, as it were, is related, and the ninth chapter evidently refers to the first. Comp. ix. 1, 7, with i. 22, 28; ix. 2, with i. 26; ix. 3, with i. 29, 30.' See p. 103.

This may be allowed to be natural and reasonable. But how does the author account for the exceptions to the use of Elohim?

In vi. 6, 7, Jehovah occurs. "It repented the *Lord*,"—"and the *Lord* said." "Here God makes his determination, a determination which is founded on his merciful intention to redeem fallen man: therefore Jehovah is used." p. 104. Extraordinary reason truly! The excision of the race of men then existing may, indeed, have been necessary to prepare the way for the accomplishment of this intention; but surely the determination to cut them off does not even intimate such an intention. "But the execution of the determination accords best with the general idea of the creator." Ibid. Elohim is consequently employed. On this theory, we might certainly expect to find Jehovah in vi. 22, where we read: "according to all that *God* commanded Noah, so did he." In fact, this term does occur in vii. 5, "that the *Lord* commanded him"; and here the author remarks, that "the highly favoured Noah must exercise obedience, blind obedience enjoined by an absolute, positive law.* Therefore, Jehovah." p. 105. But on this ground, vi. 22, and vii. 5, would both require Jehovah, since both are equally commands.

An outline of Hengstenberg's remarks must now be given.

Gen. vi—ix. Ewald considers this portion of the book as of the highest importance, in its bearing on the theory of two documents, characterized by the use of Elohim and Jehovah.† It is therefore worthy of particular attention.

* "Blinden Gehorsam durch ein willkürliches, positives Gebot."

† Komp. der Genesis, p. 81.

‘vi. 1-8 forms a sort of introduction, stating the cause of the divine judgments. With the exception of the phrase “sons of God,” Jehovah is invariably and frequently* employed. The subsequent narrative shows an abundant use of the term Elohim; though Jehovah is several times unexpectedly introduced, as in vii. 1, 5 and 16, immediately after Elohim, and in viii. 20, 21, ix. 26, immediately followed by it. Ewald takes no notice of this difficulty, and Sack’s exposition is unsatisfactory.’ p. 324-326.

“It is the author’s purpose to show how Elohim gradually became [manifested himself as] Jehovah. He has already taken the first step, and has the second in contemplation. The history of Abraham is pretty closely connected with the account of the flood; for in the intermediate portion the divine names occur but seldom, and the subjects are of such a character throughout as to make the use of Elohim inadmissible. If now the author, before entering on this new and important section of his work, wished, by the use of the divine names, to call his readers’ attention to this point, that the being who had already been exhibited as Jehovah was still in a considerable degree Elohim, and that consequently new and more glorious discoveries and revelations were still to be unfolded, this must necessarily be done in the portion under consideration, in which the very frequent use of the divine names must prevent his purpose from being hid.

“If the author had employed Elohim from the beginning, [of this portion,] one aspect of the truth would have remained concealed, namely this, that God was in a considerable degree already Jehovah, and displayed himself as such in the whole of this great occasion. He therefore in the introduction employs Jehovah frequently and with evident

* Only five times, including v. 5.

design. Consequently Elohim, which occurs so often in the subsequent representation, partly in reference to actions in connexion with which Jehovah had immediately before been made prominent, could not be misunderstood. The introduction shows that Elohim is not to be taken merely in the abstract, but that it implies this transition to Jehovah, who, in connexion with what follows, is still Elohim." p. 327, 328.

Hengstenberg then proceeds to give reasons why the term Elohim, which occurs in vi. 2, 4, and also Jehovah, where it appears after vi. 8, should be considered as exceptions to the view just stated.

After an examination of the meaning of the phrase, "sons of God," in this place, which he shows cannot be explained of angels, but only in reference to truly religious men, he remarks, that they are called 'sons of *God*' rather than of Jehovah, in contradistinction to the daughters of *men*, in accordance with ordinary usage, which employs the most general designation of the Supreme Being, when heaven and earth, God and man, are set in opposition to each other. Apart from this consideration, however, he thinks there is another reason in favour of the use of Elohim, as the dignity implied in the phrase 'sons of Jehovah' would be too great for the existing developement of the divine purposes. Such a glory must be reserved for a subsequent age. See Deut. xiv. 1, 2. p. 332.*

'The commencement of the 7th chapter, vers. 1, 5, is the proper place to note the fact, that the same being who in some respects is still Elohim simply, is in other very weighty ones Jehovah; and thus the usage in vi. 1—8, is recalled to the reader's mind. We stand here on the very verge of the great catastrophe. The authority of Jehovah determines

* Drechsler has no difficulty on this point, as, in common with many Jewish and Christian writers, he understands the phrase in question of angels. p. 91—93.

the numerical preference which Noah was to give to the clean beasts in opposition to the unclean, inasmuch as offerings were selected exclusively from the former, and these offerings were made to Jehovah. The previous command respecting the beasts proceeds* from the general care of the creator for their preservation; this particular supplementary order,† on the contrary, appertains properly to the Deity, as making himself personally known, that is, as Jehovah. It is not the difference between clean and unclean that is peculiarly connected with the use of Jehovah, for this distinction occurs in connexion with the use of Elohim, (vii. 8, 9;) it is only the solicitude to provide the larger number, which is ascribed to Jehovah.

In vii. 16, the use of Elohim marks God's care for the creatures in general, while that of Jehovah intimates his merciful intentions towards Noah, "who had found grace in his eyes." "When Jehovah shut the door after him, all the waters of heaven and earth became incapable of forcing an entrance."

In viii. 20, 21, Jehovah is entirely appropriate, as it is the account of an offering. The interchange of the terms in ix. 26, 27,—"*blessed be the Lord God of Shem; God shall enlarge Japheth,*"—is easily explained. The connexion of the two verses illustrates the connexion, which the author indirectly points out, of the two names to each other. Jehovah is the God of the Shemites, while the association of Japheth is simply with Elohim. The equality, as it respects the divine connexion, which has heretofore existed, is to cease, and Elohim will manifest himself, in union with the family of Shem, as Jehovah.'

Hengstenberg remarks further, that, if the theory main-

* He refers to vi. 19, 20.

† Alluding to vii. 2.

tained by him be true, the use of the two names may be satisfactorily accounted for, wherever they occur in the whole section. Thus the blessing, which in ix. 1 ss., is imparted to Noah by God, relates to natural benefits which are of a general character, and is a repetition of that which followed the creation, a blessing which the flood seemed to have swept away. Hence the use of Elohim. The same principle is applied by him to the subsequent use of the term in this chapter.

He concludes with the observation, that in the phrase, "Noah walked with *God*," in vi. 9, no other appellation would have been equally apposite, inasmuch as it designates his character in contradistinction to that of his ungodly contemporaries: "not with them, but with God, did Noah walk." p. 328—336.

Leaving the reader to form his own judgment on the propriety of carrying out the author's theory to the extent here developed, I must be allowed to say, that occasionally its application wants that simplicity which the mind would naturally desire. Admitting its general truth, it may be carried unreasonably far. Circumstances merely incidental may induce the writer to use the one term or the other, where no very important cause existed to lead to a preference. The phrase, "Noah walked with *God*," may be founded on the reason just given; but if the author intended to state immediately afterwards that "the earth was corrupt before *God*," and that "*God* looked upon it, and behold, it was corrupt," surely we need go no further for a reason. And the natural phraseology would be that which follows: "and *God* said unto Noah," v. 13. Comp. v. 24: "Enoch walked with *God*," and "*God* took him," with v. 1, "*God* created;" "in the likeness of *God*." Still the phrase is probably used with the view of indicating that the mind and heart both of Noah and Enoch were drawn away, in

an unusual degree, from all created objects to that holy and spiritual being by whom they had been called into existence.—In vi. 22, which refers to the determination expressed in 13, and the consequent command to Noah, we would naturally expect the same divine term to be used, independently of any reason connected with the original meaning of the word. Immediately afterwards, the Deity appears as Noah's covenant God to whom he had revealed himself, and consequently Jehovah is the term used. See vii. 1, 5. The 9th and 16th verses of the same chapter manifestly refer back to vi. 22, and therefore the word Elohim is chosen to express God's commanding; while, in the 16th verse, Noah's covenant God of revelation discloses his character and relation in the favour implied in the words, "Jehovah shut him in."

Without an examination of the work of Sack above referred to, to which I have not access, I am led to infer, from Hengstenberg's brief notice of his view, that it coincides with the one just given; although he rejects it, as manifestly unsatisfactory, (*offenbar unzureichend*. p. 326.) 'When Noah is said to walk with God, the general idea of the divine life is intended to be expressed. The subsequent revelations therefore are not attributed to Jehovah, to whom they properly belonged, but to Elohim, because connected with the decision just declared respecting Noah, that he walked with God, "*quia adjunctæ sunt illi iudicio de Noacho eunte coram deo.*"' I am not aware that any objections have been or can be urged against such a view as this, which involve any difficulty of moment.

As the principle laid down, and the modifications of it which have been proposed, are sufficient to account for the interchange of the terms in question in the whole of this section, it is proper to pass on to other portions of the book of Genesis.

Nimrod is called "a mighty hunter before Jehovah." x. 9. If the term 'hunter' is employed, as is most probable, to denote this person's oppression and tyrannical character, then the phrase "before Jehovah" implies the insolence and audacity of the man. See the note on the place. He is not to be restrained by the presence of the infinite himself. The choice of the term whereby this infinite being is denoted, would seem to be a matter of indifference. The author might have used Elohim or Jehovah, without any shade of difference in the general meaning, as either would equally convey the idea of Nimrod's impudent and licentious tyranny. Hengstenberg has failed to make out his assertion that "Jehovah and not Elohim is to be justified in this place"; for either term would be appropriate. True, indeed, the rebellious Nimrod "could neither escape the eye of the living God, which was directed towards him, nor avoid his hand." But if there be any such "deep irony" in the phrase "before Jehovah," as that writer supposes, I am at a loss to see why it should not be allowed to lurk under the other phrase, 'before God,' with equal certainty. See p. 337, 339. It may be, indeed, that the author of the book of Genesis, both here and elsewhere, selects the term Jehovah in preference to Elohim, in order to intimate that the God of his covenant people had his eye on bold and flagrant offenders, and would visit them with condign punishment, either with the view of furthering his plans towards that people, or of chastising individual offenders among them. (The latter part of the remark would apply to the cases of Er and Onan, mentioned in xxxviii. 7, 10.) But we should take care not to carry out this theory to any greater extent than the specific character of the cases may warrant. Ewald has certainly violated this principle, in saying that "it is Jehovah alone who gives laws; that, according to the constant use of language, men can sin against Jehovah only,

and not against Elohim ; and that it is Jehovah only who threatens punishment." p. 95. Gen. vi. 22. vii. 9, 16, where Elohim " commands" Noah, and xxxix. 9, where Joseph speaks of " sinning against Elohim," contradict his assertion.

Hengstenberg's undeviating adherence to his theory has an evident influence on his estimate of the religious knowledge and character of the various personages brought before us in the book of Genesis. Thus, for instance, it affects his portrait of Melchisedek. This distinguished king and priest, who is affirmed in the seventh chapter of the Hebrews to have been greater than Abraham himself, the patriarch, refers to the Deity as " the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth." Gen. xiv. 19. But, to this representation of the supreme being, Abraham prefixes the term Jehovah, v. 22, " and this must have been intended to show that Abraham has more than Melchisedek, whatever they may have held in common. The God of the latter is not merely one [among others], but he is the highest, whose authority extends over the whole world. Justice and love are in him combined with omnipotence, and his particular providence protects the pious and upright. But this view of religion, however pure, is yet imperfect. In the highest God, the lord of heaven and earth, Melchisedek has still not recognized Jehovah. As such, his exhibitions are confined to Abraham, in the way of especial revelation. In the earlier history of mankind, Jehovah, both in name and thing, is common good of the whole human race, and before the calling of Abraham, a man of the religious earnestness of Melchisedek would have recognized and named him, even if it were imperfectly." p. 344, 345. To the same effect, and if possible more plainly, does the author speak in Vol. II. p. 554. " Melchisedek is recognized by Abraham as a priest of the true God, as some centuries after Moses

was allied with Jethro, by the bond of religious community. Yet it is a *heathenish religiousness*, (eine heidnische Religiosität,) *יִרְאָת אֱלֹהִים*." And where is the proof, that a holy man like Melchisedek, dignified in the offices which he sustained, and chiefly illustrious as a type of the great high priest and king of his people, and a wise man like Jethro, whose counsel the great and inspired Hebrew legislator himself did not disdain to follow, cultivated a sort of heathenish religion, or failed to regard the God whom they worshipped and obeyed as the true Jehovah? The author's assertion, that "the more God becomes Jehovah for Abraham, the more does he become Elohim for all the rest of the world," allowing it to be generally true, is not universally so; and surely Melchisedek may well be considered as the most prominent of all exceptions. It should not be forgotten, that the covenant with Abraham could not annul God's previously made covenant with Noah, and in him with all mankind. ix. 9 ss.

'In chap. xvii,' says Drechsler, 'Jehovah is used in v. 1, and afterwards Elohim constantly, because the subject related is, as it were, a creation of a people from nothing, and therefore a powerful proof of the efficiency of God, who is for the first time described as "God Almighty," *אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי*, v. 1, for which, in subsequent verses, where Isaac's birth is promised, and also in xxi, where it is narrated, Elohim is used. Those chapters share in one category with the first chapter.' p. 189, 190.

'Elohim is used in chap. xvii, and Jehovah in chap. xviii. But, although the general subject is the same, there are some points of difference which suggest the reason of the varying use of these appellations. Chapter xvii contains the promise of the birth of a son, as the commencing point of the long and great work of the creation of a numerous people; xviii speaks merely of the birth of this son the follow-

ing year. The former is the solemn, I may say public, act; the latter contains private discourse. Abraham, as the father of a multitude of nations, and this great posterity to descend from him, constitute the leading idea of xvii, which may be said to be its perfect legal instrument, an act of official character. But in xviii, this subject is only opportunely introduced; for it was not on account of this matter, but a different one, that Jehovah showed himself in action, and he holds intercourse with Abraham and Sarah only as private persons.' p. 191, 192.

To me, all this appears to be refined and arbitrary. It assumes a gratuitous and unfounded distinction, which seems to have been devised in order to sustain a preconceived theory. Either appellation is sufficiently adapted to the subject, and it would seem unnecessary to investigate very deeply for a motive which might lead to the choice of one in preference to the other. The interchange, both here and elsewhere, may be intended to impress the reader with the conviction, that the same infinite and immutable being is denoted by each. This principle sufficiently illustrates the usage in the 19th chapter.

In chap. xx, Elohim is the prevailing term. Here the reason is plain. The narrative makes us acquainted with persons who had no other idea of God than what is implied in that word; and even that idea was very imperfect. "The fear of *God* in this place," is all that Abraham could reasonably conceive of. The name intimates also that the patriarch was under the protection of that glorious being who created the world; and it was the divine intention in the narrative, to make this truth conspicuous both to his contemporaries and also to future generations. The unexpected introduction of Jehovah in the last verse points out the identity of the being designated by the two names.

In xxi Elohim is used, except in v. 1, 33. The author

has evidently a reference to chap. xvii, in which the usage is strikingly similar, *Jehovah* being employed in the first verse, and *Elohim* always afterwards. The subject also corresponds, the one portion containing the accomplishment of what is promised in the other. Comp. xxi. 2, 3, 4, 5, with xvii. 21, 19, 10—12, 17; also, what is said in each chapter of Isaac and Ishmael respectively. The author of xxi has undoubtedly in his mind the contents of xvii. The same motive, then, which gives rise to the choice of the divine names in the one, may fairly be presumed to account for it in the other. It would therefore seem unnecessary at least, to assume with Drechsler, (p. 194.) that *Elohim* is used, when the subject relates to Ishmael, because the blessings promised to him had reference merely to God's omnipotence and creative power, exclusive of any covenant relation comprehending positive revelations. This reason would not apply to the choice of this appellation when Abraham or Isaac is the subject of discourse; and, in all probability, the author's motive is the same in both cases. Certainly, as Drechsler says, Abraham is commanded to "cast out" his son, by *God* as ruler of the world, in contradistinction to man, who had neither the right to issue nor the power to enforce such an order, and consequently *Elohim* is fitly chosen. But it is undeniable, that the expulsion had a direct and intimate relation to the divine plan concerning Abraham, and therefore the word *Jehovah* would have been equally proper.

Doubtless, the name *Jehovah* is chosen in the first verse to express God's covenant relation to the mother of the child of promise. But to me it seems fanciful, to account, as Hengstenberg does, for the use of *Elohim*, which immediately follows, (v. 2,) on the ground, that it points out "the opposition between God's word and man's word." The difference between the language 'God' and 'angel of God' in

v. 9—21, and ‘Jehovah’ and ‘angel of Jehovah’ in xvi. 7 ss., while the subject is the same in both places, he attributes to “the great diversity of the relations which resulted from the birth of Isaac. Heretofore, as Ishmael’s circumcision shows, Hagar and he had, in some degree, formed a part of the chosen family, and consequently had participated in its connexion with Jehovah. With the declaration of God in v. 12, ‘in Isaac shall thy seed be called,’ they go out of the province of Jehovah into that of Elohim. The outer separation from the chosen race was only a manifestation of that which had already taken place within. After this final separation, they had as little connexion with Jehovah as Cain, when he departed from the church of God in Eden and betook himself to the land of Nod. If in v. 20, the language was ‘and *Jehovah*,’ instead of ‘and *God* was with the lad,’ it would be an express contradiction of what is declared in v. 12.” p. 354.

An examination of the view here assumed respecting Ishmael’s exclusion from all covenant relation with Jehovah, would be foreign to my present purpose. I have only to remark, that, were it allowed to be correct, it would not explain the use of Elohim in v. 12, where it is clear that either this term or Jehovah would be equally appropriate.

The use of the divine names in the next chapter is easily explained. God, (Elohim,) the maker and the owner, requires Abraham to give up his son, and, in the very turning point of the transaction, Jehovah, by his angel, prevents the sacrifice, and manifests himself as the patriarch’s covenant God. Comp. v. 1, with 11, 12. That the change of names in this narrative is attributable to the circumstance of its being composed of two original documents, is ridiculous. This would have produced a mechanical piece of patchwork, whereas the account is remarkable for its consistency and unity. It requires no extraordinary perspicuity, in order

to enable the reader to perceive the propriety of the choice of terms whereby to denote the supreme being. But when Hengstenberg tells us, that the patriarch's "temptation would have had no object, if God had already become for him absolutely Jehovah," (p. 358,) he seems to have forgotten that "the Son" himself, whom the father had declared by "a voice from heaven" to be his "beloved" one, was tried by the severest temptations. "Jehovah," the "merciful and gracious," might subject his "friend"* to such a test, with the view of strengthening his faith, and of exhibiting his obedience to the imitation of all subsequent ages.

The remarks already made will enable the reader to explain the usage in the chapters immediately following.

In xxv. 11, it is said, that "God, (Elohim,) blessed Abraham's son Isaac." Undoubtedly, either this term or the other is equally appropriate. But, says the author just named, "we find Elohim in this place, where it would seem, at the first look, that Jehovah ought to stand. Still, if we consider that the notice here is merely occasional and preliminary, and that the author does not professedly enter on the history of Isaac until v. 19 ss., the term Elohim will appear perfectly satisfactory. It conveys here the general intimation, that the blessing of God or of heaven passed over from Abraham to Isaac. The more definite designation of this blessing follows in xxvi. 3, 12." p. 362, 363. "Isaac," says Drechsler, "is now in Abraham's place. From this time he is clothed with high authority—his cause is God's—and he himself the friend of God. And this very point, namely, that his influence extends to that higher sphere, that the connexion of the creator of the world to Abraham has passed over to him, lies in the word Elohim. And the action implied in the word "blessed," belongs principally to

* See 2 Chron. xx. 7; Isa. xli. 8; and James ii. 2, 3.

Elohim; in other words, Jehovah blesses especially with blessings of his omnipotence, his creative power." p. 197. It is unnecessary to remark, that the representations of both these writers are far-fetched, in consequence of an unnecessary application of a correct theory.

The same remark applies in part to Hengstenberg's explanation of the usage in chap. xxvii. and xxviii. The dim-sighted Isaac speaks of the perfumed clothes of the supposed Esau thus: "See, the smell of my son is as the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed." xxvii. 27. "Had the comparison been taken from an ordinary richly blooming field, Elohim would have been employed. The use of Jehovah shows that the reference is to a field such as those of Paradise, wherein the traces of the Deity clearly shine forth,—an ideal field, holding the same relation to ordinary ones, as Israel did to the heathen, a sort of magic garden," &c. Such a land of enchantment he discovers Canaan to have been in some degree, when it became the residence of the chosen people. The odoriferous vestments of Jacob are viewed by his father as the type of Jehovah's garden, to be verified for Israel, as is pointed out in the words, "God give thee of the dew of heaven and the fatness of the earth and plenty of corn and wine." v. 28. p. 365, 366. The learned writer is carried away by his imagination. Doubtless the blessings referred to are, in a good degree, "theocratical," as he says, "and appertain, not to the general, but especial providence of God;" and therefore the phraseology, "field which *Jehovah* hath blessed," is entirely apposite. But that the blessings referred to in xxv. 11, where the language is, "and God blessed Isaac," do not comprehend the same sort of benefactions, is incapable of proof. It would seem plain, that the choice of either term was in both places a matter of indifference.

In xxviii. 16, also, when Jacob awakes from his vision and

says, "surely *Jehovah* is in this place," we are told, that "*Elohim* could not have been employed," because, in that case, it would have implied Jacob's ignorance of the doctrine of the divine omnipresence. p. 368.* But the correctness of this inference depends on Jacob's meaning. Undoubtedly he might say, "God is in this place and I knew it not," if he meant that the Deity was peculiarly present to bless him. *Jehovah* indeed would be altogether appropriate, but *Elohim* might well be used, and in either case the sense would be precisely the same. The right explanation of the usage in both the chapters would seem to be in general simply this, that the *Jehovah* of xxvii. is identical with the *Elohim* of xxviii.—I have only to remark further, that Drechsler is undoubtedly right, when he represents the first four verses of chap. xxviii. as having a retrospective reference to chap. xvii. See p. 198. Compare especially the third verse of the former with the first of the latter.

xxix. 31—xxx. 24. In this section, the terms by which the Deity is designated are interchangeably used in connexion with the birth of Jacob's sons. The principles already laid down sufficiently explain the usage. And the frequent use of *Elohim* in chap. xxx. calls the reader's attention to the births in reference to which it occurs, as peculiar favours of

* According to Ewald, "Jacob is reminded that his own family God is near him even in remote lands." Of course, any other term than *Jehovah* would fail of the object. "That some deity ruled over the country, Jacob had no need to be informed; but that his powerful family God bore sway here also, he recognizes with the greatest joy." p. 59. According to this view, Jacob's knowledge of the true God was like that of Balak, who supposed that, although the divine influence might indeed prevent Balaam from cursing the Israelites from one spot, another might be selected in which it should not be exerted; or, of those Syrians who thought, that "the Lord might be God of the hills, but not of the valleys." See Num. xxiii. 13, 27; 1 Kings, xx. 23, 28. How different this is from the real fact, it were idle to show to any believer in the inspiration of the Scriptures.

a beneficent Providence. It is unnecessary to search farther for any recondite motive for the choice of the term. But the writer to whom I am so much indebted, and from whose particular views I am compelled so often to dissent, is not satisfied with such a general solution. He finds a reason in what he supposes to be the internal condition of the two sisters at the various times of their becoming mothers. "Leah had suffered unrighteous treatment, and been subjected to mortification; Jacob's averseness to her was chiefly attributable to her hard-hearted and invidious sister, who made this averseness an occasion of ridicule and contempt. Under these circumstances Leah and the author both recognized, in her own fruitfulness and Rachel's barrenness, not merely the general operation of Providence, but the especial influence of the righteous, retributive God. At the birth of "her maid's" children, no reference to the Deity occurs. In that of the 5th and 6th sons, an influence of Elohim is recognized; that particular significancy intended by the birth of the first four, here finds no place; the object designed had been effected, and things resume their ordinary course; Leah's consciousness of the divine influence is less active; her eye is principally directed to natural causes, and she acknowledges only an indefinite divine co-operation."*

"The later feeling of Leah influenced Rachel from the beginning. She had no impulse raising her to Jehovah, whom she could not but regard in the light of a judge and avenger. She would the more hesitate to express his name at the birth of "her maid's" sons, in proportion as she was conscious how much she had contributed to the event. After she has recognized the favour of God in the birth of

* He then refers to what he had before said on the birth of Abel. See above, p. 19, 20.

her own first son, does she become more confident. She ventures to apply to Jehovah for a second son, forgetting that he ought to be the object of her fear, inasmuch as she persists in unrighteous conduct towards her sister. The son she prays for from Jehovah is indeed given by Jehovah, but as the son of her sorrow." p. 374, 375.

It is impossible to read this representation of the simple narrative without feeling, that, while it contains some truth, it is overstrained and unjust to Rachel. Her sentiments towards her less loved, but, as a mother, more favoured sister, are doubtless not to be vindicated; but this writer's exceedingly unfavourable exhibition of them is unwarranted, and the inferences he deduces altogether extravagant. Rachel's language on occasion of the birth of Dan, is a pious recognition of the divine protection, and on becoming herself the mother of Joseph, her piety and gratitude and faith are alike conspicuous. Undeviating adherence to a theory seems in this instance not only to have perverted Dr. Hengstenberg's judgment, but to have dimmed his perception of right. His mode of accounting for the use of Elohim on the birth of Leah's fifth and sixth sons, when Jehovah had been employed by her before, is quite unnecessary, and assumes a change of views and feelings in the mother, wholly improbable.

In some other portions of Genesis, the author's assumptions appear to be equally arbitrary. Knowledge of Jehovah, and what the word implies in denoting God's relation to men, is attributed or denied, in accordance with the theory, when the outward circumstances and internal characteristics of the individuals, (so far as the brevity of the narrative allows us to form a judgment respecting them,) afford little or no ground for the very important conclusions deduced. I cannot but think that this observation applies not only to what has already been quoted concerning Leah

and Rachel, but also to some of his remarks in reference to the father of these women. It is especially applicable to his declaration respecting Esau, made in order to illustrate Jacob's use of Elohim in xxxiii. 11, while in xxxii. 9—12, he had appealed to Jehovah as the author of all his mercies. "Jehovah lay without the circle of Esau's religious views, whose piety was superficial, and who had only an occasional hour of devotion." p. 379. Admitting this delineation of Esau's religious character to be in general correct, it does not prove that the name Jehovah was not familiarly used by him, as it undoubtedly was in his father's family, much less that Jacob was led, by such a consideration, deliberately to choose the term Elohim in preference to the other.

Chaps. xxxix.—l. In the former part of this section, the term Jehovah predominates, and is always used when the author is himself the speaker. In the other parts, Elohim maintains the supremacy, and is changed occasionally for God Almighty, which is of similar import. Indeed, the word Jehovah is only employed once in the last ten chapters of Genesis, namely, in Jacob's dying ejaculation, xlix. 18, while in the same portion Elohim occurs eighteen times. On the other hand, in chap. xxxix., the former term appears eight times, and the latter only once. The repeated use of Jehovah in this chapter might be expected, as Joseph's condition was subject to the influence of that special providence which superintended the chosen race, protected them in Egypt, and thus prepared them for their future destination. The use of Elohim in the ninth verse, may be accounted for as Hengstenberg (p. 384,) and Drechsler, (p. 204,) suggest, on the ground that Joseph is addressing a heathen, to whom this general designation would be more appropriate, if not more intelligible, than the other more particular name. In repelling the advances of Potiphar's wife, he

says, "How can I do this great wickedness, and sin against *God*?" The subsequent use of Elohim is easily explained on the principles already stated; and it is unnecessary to trouble the reader with a repetition of them. But when Hengstenberg attempts to account for its introduction in xli. 51, 52, where Joseph ascribes his happy condition to "*God*, because he did not regard the birth of his sons as connected with the development of the divine kingdom," and because "it is the general idea of providence which here rules, the indefinite feeling of dependence which governs him," (p. 385,) he says what may possibly be true, but what he neither does nor can establish, and is exceedingly improbable. And why should he assume this of Joseph, and just the very contrary of Leah? It may indeed be admitted, that, in xlv. 5—9, the use of Elohim marks the divine agency in contradistinction to the merely human; but where does he find proof of his declaration, (introduced as a probable exposition of the use of Elohim in v. 9.) that "Jacob had been wholly governed by human considerations, and had entirely lost from his view the leadings of God, by whom and not by man he was to be drawn to Egypt"? p. 386. Neither the history in general, nor the uniform course of conduct of the patriarch, in any degree favours such a supposition. It is a gratuitous aspersion of his religious character, like that before attempted to be thrown on the wife of his earlier and deeper affections.

Indeed, this learned writer is not himself satisfied with the application of his theory, in every case in which these two divine names occur in the latter portion of Genesis. He says, that 'although the use of Elohim in xlviii. 9, "these are my sons whom *God* hath given me," may be vindicated, if we keep the connexion out of view; yet, it is evident, that the more suitable term would be Jehovah, whose blessing immediately follows. So also in v. 11, "Lo! *God* hath

showed me thy seed," Elohim may indeed be justified, as expressive of divine direction in opposition to human purpose ; yet, the solemnity of the occasion would rather lead us to expect the grateful heart to raise itself to Jehovah. Along with places in which Elohim must necessarily stand, are found several in which it does answer sufficiently well, but Jehovah equally so, and some in which Jehovah is plainly the more suitable. These phenomena are surprising, and would seem to require the admission of some grounds for the usage particularly appropriate to themselves.' p. 386—388.

The author very judiciously rejects the solution advanced by Sack, that Joseph uses the word Elohim in accordance with that heathen influence by which he was surrounded ; and that Jacob, in his intercourse with him, acquiesces in the same usage. His own is vastly more respectful to the venerable patriarchs, but whether supported on surer grounds, is, to say the least, doubtful. He had before suggested, that, in the earlier patriarchal history, the frequent use of Elohim, and the designed omission of Jehovah, intimated the approach of a new period in the development of the divine character and being. He applies the same principle in the cases in contemplation, which correspond with the usage in the earlier portion of Exodus, in which Elohim, not Jehovah, is the prevailing term. "The Jehovah-sun," says he, "had hidden himself behind a cloud in reference to the chosen race ; they hoped that he would again burst forth in clearer splendor than ever, but were conscious that for the present he was not to be seen. The descent into Egypt must necessarily direct their eager expectation to the future. But in proportion as their eye was turned to the glorious revelations of God still in prospect, he was to them for the present Elohim." p. 390, 391.

If, now, the invariable usage in the previous part of the

book of Genesis were manifestly such as to show, that the author had strictly kept in view the etymological and really different meaning of the two divine names, the solution suggested by Hengstenberg, or some other accommodated to the difficulty, might be accepted; but, as so many cases occur, where the principle is either altogether or partially inapplicable, the instances referred to in the latter part of the book are to be classed in the same category with those. Inasmuch as they contain nothing peculiar, they are fairly explicable on the grounds already stated.

Ewald would account for the use of Elohim in xlix. 29—l. 26, in xl. 8, and many other places, on the ground that the subject has no reference to the national god of the Hebrews, but merely to God, considered as superintending and directing the condition of a family. p. 45 ss. But this is evidently unsatisfactory, for the character and condition of a nation did certainly belong to the Hebrews when in Egypt, more properly than in the time of Abraham or Isaac, and even in the earlier period of Jacob's life; and yet, in these latter circumstances, the national name, as he would call it, is frequently applied. Here, I presume, he would introduce his hypothesis of a second document.

There is doubtless a large proportion of places in Genesis, where the author has been led to the choice of these terms respectively, because of some peculiar adaptation of the one or the other to the subject in connexion with which it occurs. There are other portions in which he seems to have employed both, in order to prevent the possibility of his reader's supposing a different being to be intended. And probably there are still others in which the usage differs for the sake of variety, and because no particular motive existed to determine his mind to the choice of one rather than the other. If some cases do exist, in which it is difficult and perhaps impossible to settle the ground of the choice of these appellations of the

supreme being, the variety of the usage is no proof of different original documents. One writer may have varied the terms for the best of reasons, although in some instances not now discoverable.

I conclude this introduction with the following extracts from Jahn, p. 208 ss., with such slight modification of his language as appears to be necessary in order to make his view in all respects correct.

“The records contained in the book of Genesis are not the fictions or allegories by which in very ancient times wise men chose to veil their philosophical opinions, neither are they mythi, or histories intermingled with mythi, such as other nations relate concerning their earliest ages; but they are true histories. This will be evident from the following considerations.

“These relations were committed to writing nearly a thousand years before the mythi of the most ancient nations. But in those remote times, the ordinary life of man extended to so great a length, that there could be no necessity for oral tradition to pass through the mouths of many generations. Methuselah was contemporary with Adam during the first two hundred and forty-three years of his life, and with Noah during the last six hundred, and Noah with Abraham fifty-eight years. Thus three generations would have transmitted the account of the creation of the world to Abraham. The histories of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were committed to writing not long after their times, and from Jacob to Moses it would seem that only four generations intervened.* Some,

* It is a common opinion, that in Ex. vi. 14--19, some generations are omitted, because four hundred and thirty years make thirteen generations instead of four. But, as in Gen. xv. 13, 16, four generations are in express terms made equivalent to four hundred years, and as the two hundred and fifteen years which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob spent in Canaan occupied only two generations, it is evident that a generation at

indeed, have considered the longevity which is ascribed to the men of the first ages of the world as a mythus, simply because they imagined it to be impossible that the human body should subsist so many years. But no reasonable person will maintain that everything was the same in those early ages, especially before the deluge, as it is now. Why, then, must the age of man have necessarily been the same at that time as at present? All other nations extend the

that time comprehended a hundred years, and not merely thirty-four, as was the case at a much later period.

Thus Dr. Jahn. And the remark may be correct. But it ought to be considered that a principle which would be applicable to the time of Abraham, would hardly suit that of Moses, when the period of human life had been greatly abridged. The truth is, there is difficulty connected with the question how long the Israelites remained in Egypt. In favour of the shorter period of two hundred and fifteen years, it may be said, that this agrees best with St. Paul's remark in Gal. iii. 17, that "the law was four hundred and thirty years after the promise;" that this space accords with the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch and Septuagint version in Ex. xii. 40, which add the clause "and in the land of Canaan," which is not in the Hebrew. Compare the following texts in Genesis, which show that the space of time between Abraham's removal from Haran and Jacob's descent to Egypt was two hundred and fifteen years: xii. 4; xxi. 5; xxv. 26; xlvii. 9. This view corresponds best with the genealogy in Ex. vi. and Num. xxvii. 1. It would seem also from Num. xxvi. 59, that the mother of Moses was the daughter of Levi.

On the other hand, in favour of a residence of four hundred or four hundred and thirty years, the express declarations in Gen. xv. 13, cannot be set aside. Comp. also Acts vii. 6. The Hebrew of Ex. xii. 60, is also exceedingly strong, and the addition of the Samaritan and Septuagint have the appearance of a gloss designed to remove a supposed difficulty. St. Paul may be allowed, in a matter which had no bearing on his argument, to follow the Septuagint, as best known to the mass of his readers.

The genealogy of Joshua in 1 Chron. vii. 20—27, which descends from Ephraim through ten generations at least, corresponds best with the longer period. The difficulty from Num. xxvi. 59, is examined by PERIZONIUS in his *Ægyptiacæ Origines*, cap. xx. p. 356 ss.; but he has not succeeded in satisfactorily removing it.

lives of the first inhabitants of earth to some thousands of years; the records in Genesis, therefore, which give a far more moderate duration of existence, are not to be suspected of falsehood in this particular. The ancient worthies esteemed the patriarchal accounts of very great importance, as the groundwork and witness of their religion; as such they taught them to their children, and in old age frequently repeated the oft-told story, so that there could be little danger of the narrative being misunderstood or designedly corrupted. Such parts as had been clothed in verse, vestiges of which occur in Gen. iv. 23, 24, would be the more easily retained in memory, and could not be altered without injuring the parallelism or disturbing the harmony; and this would lead to the observation and correction of the error.

“The events related are fewer, and the narratives less full, and perhaps more obscure in proportion to the antiquity of the accounts and the length of time during which they were preserved by tradition; while, on the contrary, those which are the most modern are also the most complete. From this it is evident that the compiler or author of Genesis must have rejected all uncertain and suspicious accounts, very many of which had doubtless come down from a period of considerable antiquity, and must have received those only the correctness of which was unquestionable.

“Further, the subjects of the narrative are of the simplest kind, and altogether dissimilar to those which fill the earliest histories of other nations. If in any respects a slight similitude is discoverable, it is still evident that the latter are feigned or amplified and distorted by fictions, while the former exhibit merely the simple truth. This was acknowledged, without any hesitation, by the heathen, whether learned or unlearned, who in the first ages of Christianity turned from the contemplation of their own fables to that of the Hebrew Scriptures. Besides, those doubtful or partly

fictitious narrations, or, if the definition be preferred, philosophical opinions clothed in allegorical language, which are known by the name of *mythi*, are single fragments, which have no real connexion either among themselves or with genuine history. But the accounts in the book of Genesis are indissolubly connected with each other and with history in general. The *mythi* abound with fictions relating principally to gods and goddesses and demigods, to their wars, and even to their obscene and sexual intercourse. They relate to demons, heroes, nymphs, and metamorphoses, also to the inventors of useful arts and founders of noble families, whose origin they fabulously ascribe to an intermixture of the divine with the human. In the first book of the Pentateuch, nothing of the kind is to be found. The accounts which it contains relate only to one God, the creator and governor of the universe, and the preserver and guardian of morals and religion, to the establishment, protection, and promotion of which they are devoted; and they hold forth the prospect of an auspicious and blessed period, when true religion and virtue shall be propagated among all nations. That this prediction has been already fulfilled in a great degree, is undeniable; and past accomplishment encourages the believer to anticipate its completion.

“Should it be granted that alterations may have taken place in these accounts, yet even this would not render the character of the principal parts on which the history rests suspicious. Those portions which might be supposed to be most liable to suspicion of corruption or fiction, are such as may be thought to border on the marvellous, such as the accounts of divine revelations. But these very accounts of revelations contain predictions of the perpetual duration of the religion which they teach among the posterity of its first possessors, and of its future propagation among all nations, which it would have been impossible for the authors

of these accounts, whoever they were, to invent. See Gen. xii. 1—3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18, xxvi. 4, xxviii. 14, xviii. 19, and xvii. 4—14. The idea of God, which pervades all these records, is such as would never have originated with unassisted man.

“It may be remarked farther, that if these narratives, like the fabulous accounts of other nations, had been altered so as to suit the fancy of the narrator, they would have differed in many respects from their present form. As good morals are everywhere inculcated in them, the immoralities and facts of doubtful character which now occur and are certainly but little honourable to the principal personages of the history, would have been omitted. The various narratives which appear in the book of Genesis would not have corresponded so accurately with the nature of things; the speeches which it contains (see particularly xliii. 1—14, and xlv. 18—44,) would hardly have been so exactly suited to the characters and situations of their respective authors; the general character of the personages would not have been preserved with such uniform and permanent consistency, but would have approached occasionally to caricature; the four hundred years of Gen. xv. 30, would have been changed into four hundred and thirty, to correspond with Ex. xii. 40; the apparent contradictions would have been reconciled; in one word, the whole narration would not have been so perfectly consentaneous to the general course of things observable in other histories.*

* “Illustrative of the manner in which the rationalists exhibit the statements made in the Bible, and endeavour to place them on the same footing with the early and fabulous accounts of other nations,” I quote from the notice of Drechsler, already referred to, in the *New York Review*, p. 134, 135.

“‘It is well known,’ says Von Bohlen, ‘that all the nations of antiquity possessed accounts of the early history of mankind, of the increase

“The arguments which have been urged against the historical credit of the documents employed by the author of the book of Genesis do not prove that the narrations originally given in these documents have been altered, but only that they may have been; that is, in effect, they prove nothing, for the argument from possibilities to facts is void of all force. He attempts to show that the narrations contained in these documents cannot be true, are entirely futile. Such is the assertion, that our first parents could not have immediately related the events described in Gen. ii. 4—iii. 24,

and extension of the human race, and even of the creation of the universe. In immediate connexion with them is the knowledge of God, his being and attributes, his connexion with the world, and particularly with men. These accounts remind us of a period, during which God or divine beings came down to earth, walked among men in human form, trying their virtue, promising and threatening, rewarding and punishing. To say all in one word, most of the eastern nations possessed writings similar in their contents to those of the Old Testament; and this not only in general, but often in particular, and even in a remarkable degree.’

“From this representation, which no literary man thinks of questioning, what is to be gained? From promises like these, what results? As the accounts referred to are undoubtedly fabulous, the rationalist writer infers or assumes that those in the Old Testament are of the same character. A more direct and palpable begging of the question cannot be imagined. It is, as Drechsler says, a logical blunder. The possible suppositions of which the case admits are three. Either, several of these different accounts contain portions of historical truth; or, as Von Bohlen thinks, all are untrue; or one alone is really and historically the true statement. The sober and rational inquirer will not content himself with assuming that condition, which his prepossessions may have constituted the favourite one in his mind, but will carefully examine the evidence of all, and admit the one in favour of which the evidence preponderates.”

To maintain, as the neological party in Germany have done, that a narrative must be fabulous or fictitious, or of comparatively late date, because its contents are of a prophetic or miraculous character, presumes the impossibility of prophecy or miracle, and is a course of procedure utterly unworthy of the name of argument.

in consequence of the imperfection of their language ; and that when their stock of words had increased, they could not have remembered the events of their earliest existence, because without words nothing could be retained beyond an obscure recollection of things. But neither of these assertions is true. For, as to the former, our first parents were adult in the first moment of their existence, possessing the use of all the faculties of their minds, and of all the members of their bodies. They had, moreover, both the power of speech and incitement to its use, so that as soon as the ideas which must have entered their minds immediately upon their existence were conceived, they expressed them in language. With respect to the other assertion, the ideas produced during the first moments of their existence, when in possession of all their intellectual powers, whether they were produced by the impressions of the senses or by the instructions of the Deity, would be the most tenaciously retained by the mind, for the very reason that they were the first ; they would be treasured in its inmost recesses, so as to be readily recollected during the remainder of life, and easily narrated in language sufficiently copious at any subsequent period.

“There can be no doubt that the doctrine of a creating Deity, and consequently that of the creation and origin of all things, are maintained throughout the whole of the book of Genesis ; for the object of all the documents employed in its compilation, is to teach, that this doctrine was revealed to our first parents, that it was preserved by especial divine providence until the time of Abraham, and that it was to be preserved and at last propagated among all nations. The account therefore of the creation, with which the book commences, inasmuch as it coincides with this general object, is not a fiction, nor a poetical description of the creation, nor a philosophical speculation of some ancient sage, but, as

the historical tenor of the whole narration shows, a real history. And, inasmuch as no witness existed to recount the particulars of the creation of the earth, it is evident that the matter of this history must have been derived from divine revelation, given for the purpose of instructing the early inhabitants of earth, in the manner best suited to their capacities, that there is no divine being or object of worship except the creator, and that the general objects of creation were destined for the use of man, so that they are not divinities, but, on the contrary, he is their Lord."

ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS is divided by the Jews into twelve larger sections, called Pharshioth, פַּרְשִׁיּוֹת; and in some copies into forty-three smaller ones, denominated Sedarim, סְדָרִים. But, independently of this division, and that of fifty chapters, adopted in our English translation, both of which are arbitrary, the attentive reader will perceive another in the construction of the book itself. It is composed of eleven parts,¹ each of which has an appropriate inscription or introductory notice of the subject concerning which it treats. They are as follows: Part I. chap. i. 1—ii. 3, inclusive; II. ii. 4—iv. 26; III. v. 1—vi. 8; IV. vi. 9—ix. 29; V. x. 1—xi. 9; VI. xi. 10—26; VII. xi. 27—xxv. 11; VIII. xxv. 12—18; IX. xxv. 19—xxxv. 29; X. xxxvi.; XI. xxxvii. 1—l. 26.

PART I. CHAP. I. 1—II. 3.

The first part contains an account of the creation, either of the visible universe, or of the solar system, or of the earth. If the sacred writer had the visible universe in view, as is probable from the general nature of some of the language employed,² it is undeniable that in the details he confines himself to the globe which we inhabit. Whether the first verse is an introduction, intended to state, in the way of a

general proposition, the same course of action which the subsequent verses specify,—or whether it relates the original creation of the mass itself, out of which the world was formed in the manner and order afterwards recounted, it is perhaps impossible to say.³

The condition of the earth before it was reduced to order by its almighty maker, is described as one of confusion. Covered with water, it appeared as a shapeless mass, without such arrangements and provisions as were necessary to fit it for the reception of its future inhabitants.⁴ Preparatory to this result, the Spirit of God is represented as acting on the chaos, impregnating⁵ the dead substance with the principles of life and motion. At the will of God,⁶ light begins to pervade the sluggish mass; and by the rotatory motion of the earth, the vicissitude of night and day is produced. v. 2—5.

During a subsequent revolution the vital principle still continues to operate. From the watery mass vapors arise and the firmament presents itself, visibly separating the dense fluid below from the lighter aqueous body sustained by the clouds. To this apparently solid substance, God gives the name of heaven, thereby indicating its elevation. 6—8.⁷

On the third day, the waters which still continued to cover the surface of the earth, are made to flow together into their vast reservoirs, and thus the dry ground and the seas are formed.—Preparation having been thus made by the formation of light, of atmospheric air, and of earth suitably separated from the water, life is called into existence. The earth teems with its various productions, and the once waste and desert surface exhibits the varied beauties of arranged nature in all its vegetable kingdom. 9—13.

The fourth day presents to the supposed observer of progressive creation the effect of the same vital action which

had been going on from the commencement. The light which on the first day had begun to penetrate the dark chaotic mass, and which the separation of the fluids afterwards increased, bursts forth in its pure unveiled brilliancy. In the now cleared up vault of heaven the glorious sun appears, the great lord of day; also the moon, evidently the inferior luminary, which is poetically represented as the queen of night, attended by her innumerable train, the stars. According to the principle which evidently governs the writer in the whole narrative of the creation, the heavenly bodies are said to be made for the benefit of the future inhabitants of this globe, as signs to designate various periods of time, and also as luminaries to enlighten the earth. And this representation is repeated. 14—19.⁸

Animal life now appears. Fishes and birds of different kinds are created on the fifth day, and on the sixth the various creatures which the earth sustains on its surface. 20—25.

In the account of man's formation, the language used indicates somewhat more of solemnity, of dignified deliberation, than that before employed. Heretofore we read of every thing called into being: "and God said, let" this or that take place, and the effect follows the expression of his will. But now the variation is striking: "and God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness."⁹ The creation follows, and man appears, the noblest of earth's inhabitants, the lord of this lower world, endowed with immortality, and in moral character holy, like his maker. 26—28.¹⁰ This is followed by the grant of vegetables and fruits to be used as food by all the animal creation. 29, 30.¹¹ The almighty creator surveys the workmanship of his hands, and pronounces every thing to be good. The sixth day attests that all is finished. 31.

The section concludes by instructing us, that, inasmuch as

God had completed his work, he sanctified the seventh day, in memory of the glorious result. ii. 1—3.¹²

PART II. CHAP. II. 4—IV. 26.

We are here presented with an account of the state of the world immediately after its creation, together with some highly interesting and important facts relating to the early history of man.

At the time of the creation, vegetable productions did not spring from the ground, through the influence of rain and human industry, but, as the text implies, by a direct, divine power. Since that period, nature has taken its ordinary course. Mists have risen from the ground, and have come down in refreshing showers, and man, formed of the earth and endowed with a divinely communicated principle of life, has cultivated the soil. 4—7.¹³ The narration now proceeds to tell us of the settlement of man in the garden of Eden, particularly mentioning its two most important productions, the tree of life, and the tree of knowledge. The former seems to have derived its name from its properties in continuing life, plainly alluded to in iii. 22; and the latter, from the practical knowledge of evil in contradistinction to good, which unhappily flowed from its use, which is interdicted under the penalty of death.¹⁴ A river is said to have supplied the garden with water, and hence to have formed four principal streams, which are named and otherwise geographically designated.¹⁵ The accommodation of the man with a companion adapted to his nature and wants, is closely connected with his examining and naming the various animals, none of whom was sufficiently dignified to become the spouse of creation's lord. From the substance of the man himself the woman is created by almighty power, and he recognizes her as a fit companion, expressing the depth of his

affection by identifying her with his own person.¹⁶ Immediately the historian declares the inviolable character of the marriage union, to which every other relationship, even that of parent and child, must yield precedence.¹⁷ He subjoins an intimation of the primæval purity of the first pair. 8—25.

In the third chapter we have an account of the fall of our first parents from the state of innocence in which they were created.¹⁸ The devil, either assuming a serpent as his instrument, or allegorically represented under the figure of a serpent,¹⁹ (an animal considered by the ancients as particularly prudent and cunning, and therefore selected as best fitted for the purpose,) tempts the woman to disregard the prohibition of the use of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, by assuring her that the threatened consequences should not take place, but, on the contrary, that the use of the fruit, so excellent in itself and so beautiful in appearance, would impart a divine wisdom, enabling the partaker to discriminate between good and evil. The woman yielded to the temptation; and, at her offer, the man also ate of the fruit and transgressed the divine law. 1—6. The lamentable effects immediately follow. Their knowledge is indeed increased,²⁰ but it is a practical knowledge of sin and misery. They are conscious of the loss of purity, and endeavor to remove their sense of shame, by resorting to a rude covering of intertwined boughs of the fig-tree. At the approach of their almighty father towards the evening, a sense of guilt leads them to the silly attempt to conceal themselves from the Omniscient. But it is impossible to escape his investigation. He examines the facts of the case, and passes sentence on all the parties. In the first place, the tempter himself is condemned to a state of utter degradation and servility; perpetual enmity between his race and that of the woman is to be established; although

he shall be permitted to injure the latter in an inferior degree, yet in the end it shall completely destroy his energy and power.²¹ Next, the sentence of the woman is announced; subjection to the man, and pains and distresses peculiar to the female sex. Lastly, the punishment of the man is declared. The ground must be cultivated with hard and incessant toil; its natural productions shall be thorns; the path of life shall be chequered with sorrows, till at last death closes the scene, and the body, forsaken by the soul, the animating breath of the Almighty, degenerates into its original dust. 7—19.²² The history then mentions the name given by Adam to his wife and the reason of it;²³ and states, that, by divine direction, they were both clothed with the skins of animals.²⁴ It closes by relating their expulsion from Paradise, and the means adopted to prevent their access to the tree of life.²⁵

The history of the fall is succeeded by a narrative, which strikingly depicts its natural consequences, by exhibiting the deformity of sin. Cain and Abel, two of the children of our first parents,²⁶ are represented as bringing their offerings to God, each selecting for the token of his homage a portion of the fruits of his industry in his respective avocation. That of the former was rejected because of his wickedness, while the faith of the latter secured its acceptance.²⁷ The divine impartiality, (Acts x. 34, 35,) and the warning and exhortation accompanying it,²⁸ produced no good effect on the mind of Cain. On the contrary, he yielded to the impulse of uncontrolled passion, and murdered his brother. iv. 1—8. Divine justice inquires into the crime, which the fratricide attempts to conceal by a falsehood, expressed with that insolence which sometimes characterizes persons who are under the influence of the “wicked one.” But in vain. The atrocity of the deed demands punishment. The very earth feels the unnaturalness of the act, and drinks in the murdered

brother's blood, endeavoring to hide the shame of her unworthy son. At the same time, her detestation of the act is shown, by refusing to bless the murderer. To such a wretch earth will not yield its strength, and, without a habitation or subsistence, he becomes "a vagabond." 9—12. The unhappy culprit feels the wretchedness of his condition. Whether he laments the severity of his punishment or the "exceeding sinfulness" of his crime, may be uncertain; but it can hardly be doubted, that some penitential character must have been perceived by the searcher of hearts before he threatened seven-fold vengeance on the man who should take the life of Cain. So great is the wretched fratricide's distress, that his faith in the divine promise of protection is confirmed by a sign, which was probably miraculous. 13—15.²⁹ Still, this does not prevent Cain's banishment. He settles in a country, which, perhaps, derived its name from the fact of his expulsion.³⁰ There he becomes the father of Enoch, the ancestor of Lamech; the descendants of whose two wives are particularly distinguished. Those of the one are noted for the skill with which they pursued pastoral occupations, and refined society by musical inventions and improvements; while those of the other became "artificers in brass and iron," thus contributing to the progress of those arts which make human life comfortable and easy. 16—22. Some unknown circumstances appear to have given uneasiness to Lamech's wives, whom he comforts with the assurance, that he was exposed to no danger, and that any attempt on his life would not fail to draw down the severest judgments. 23, 24.³¹ After noticing the birth of Seth, whom maternal piety and affection regard as a substitute for the lost Abel, and the birth also of a son to Seth, this part of the book concludes with the statement, that public worship then began to be celebrated in honor of

Jehovah, in contradistinction probably to incipient idolatry. 25, 26.³²

PART III. CHAP. V. 1—VI. 9.

This part begins with a genealogical list of Adam's³³ descendants to Noah through the line of Seth. vi. 32.³⁴ Among the most remarkable is Enoch, alike distinguished for his exalted piety, and its extraordinary reward, an early translation to God without subjection to death. 22—24.³⁵ The curse of toilsome labor denounced against Adam, iii. 17, seems to have been particularly oppressive to Lamech; and, either in the prospect of assistance to be obtained from his son's co-operation in cultivating the soil, or in the hope that his son's labors might lead to an increase of piety, and thus lessen or remove that part of the penal consequences of the first transgression, he gives him a name expressive of the rest and comfort which he hoped to attain. 29.³⁶—If the patriarch did indulge this hope, subsequent events showed its utter fallacy. The degeneracy of mankind seems to have kept pace with their increase. Descendants of the pious, associates of the people of God, intermarried with those of an opposite character, allured by beauty and governed by inclination. vi. 1, 2.³⁷ As might be expected, the divine judgment is threatened, while at the same time space is allowed for repentance. 3.³⁸ Revolt from God, lawless aggression, and proud desire of human distinction, seem to characterize the wickedness of that period. 4, 5.³⁹ In language adapted to human feeling and comprehension, God is said to have repented that he had made man, and to be grieved at the heart. He determines to destroy the abandoned ingrates, while he spares the righteous Noah. 6—8.

PART IV. CHAP. VI. 9—XI. 29.

This portion is introduced by an inscription stating it to be the history of Noah. The principal point in the narrative is the account of the deluge. The general wickedness of men requires that the punishment should extend to the whole human race, and therefore God expresses his determination to cut off all mankind, and to lay the earth waste. 9—13.⁴⁰ Noah is commanded to construct an ark or navigable vessel of cypress wood, of capacious dimensions, with proper apertures for the admission of light and air. 14—16.⁴¹ While the devouring element is to destroy the mass of living creatures, Noah and his family are to be preserved in this vessel, together with the various classes of animals which would otherwise perish in the waters. Two of unclean and seven of clean beasts are the numbers specified.⁴² These are introduced into the ark, certainly not without an extraordinary influence of divine Providence, which indeed might be expected under such circumstances, and is in harmony with the character of the whole transaction. The natural causes of the flood are stated to be the incessant torrents of rain that fell during forty days and nights, and the vast swell of the ocean, produced doubtless by the operation of volcanic and other agitating elements in the bowels of the earth. “The fountains of the great deep,” and “the windows of heaven,” (vii. 11,) express these causes in language beautifully simple, yet highly poetic. The waters covered the top of the highest ground to the depth of fifteen cubits, and for the space of one hundred and fifty days continued to increase and to desolate the earth. 17—vii. 24.

The melancholy condition of the patriarch may well be imagined; but the divine mercy displays itself: “God re-

membered Noah." What a beautiful expression of parental affection ! The rain ceases ; the ocean falls back into its deepened bed, and the ark rests on the mountains of Armenia.⁴³ With unutterable joy Noah beholds the tops of the mountains just beginning to show themselves. He sends out a raven ; then a dove, which at first returns as she went, but afterwards brings back in her mouth the "olive leaf," token of peace, and proof that the waters had subsided. Sent out a third time, she returns no more. viii. 1—12.

Now the ground is comparatively dry, and Noah's family leave the ark, accompanied by its numerous inmates. A solemn act of devotion marks the patriarch's gratitude, and is graciously accepted by his almighty preserver. He determines no more to bring such a destruction on the earth. He will not "be extreme to mark what is done amiss;" for man's earliest imaginations are, like his nature, evil. 13—22. Then follows the divine blessing bestowed on the family of Noah, in language like that before addressed to Adam, (i. 28,) with the express grant, however, of animal food, the blood or life excepted.⁴⁴ Capital punishment is threatened to the murderer ; and, to increase man's horror at the taking of human life, the unconscious, irrational brute is to bear the penalty of his unintentional manslaughter. The dignity of man's nature, created originally in the image of God, is stated as a reason for the severe penalty. By defacing the divine likeness, the murderer attempts, as it were, to mar, if not to destroy the divinity itself. ix. 1—7.⁴⁵ The promise before made, not to destroy all living things by another flood, a promise equivalent to a solemn agreement made by the creator with his creatures, is renewed ; and the rainbow, which probably at that time spanned the vault of heaven, is made the sign of its accomplishment. The promise is repeated, in token of perpetuity. 8—17.

The fact of Noah's three sons being the sole fathers of

the second world is then distinctly stated. This is followed by the narrative of Noah's planting a vineyard, and, on too free indulgence in the wine, through ignorance probably of the strength of the liquor, becoming intoxicated, and indecently exposed. The unfilial behaviour of Ham, and the pious and modest deportment of his two brothers, becoming known to the patriarch on his awaking, he predicts the future fates of their respective descendants. On the posterity of Ham, through his son Canaan, he denounces the curse of degraded servitude, which was remarkably verified in the future history of the Canaanitish nations. By blessing Jehovah as the God of Shem, he implies a benediction of the highest kind on Shem himself, inasmuch as the "people whose God is the Lord" cannot but be "happy." Ps. cxliv. 15. To the posterity of Japheth, he promises wide and extensive territory; and the progress and prodigious increase of numerous colonies, founded by Europeans in various parts of the world, have for ages attested the truth of the prediction, and are still continuing to add to its evidence. The occupancy of territory by the posterity of Japheth, which was originally peopled by that of his brother, may be intended by the phrase, "he shall dwell in the tents of Shem"; but more probably it alludes to the future connexion of the descendants of each, as associated together principally in religious harmony, by the union of Japheth's progeny with the Hebrews in the kingdom of the Messiah.⁴⁸ A brief notice of the age and death of Noah forms the conclusion of this part of the book. 18—29.

PART V. CHAP. X. 1—XI. 9.

This part may be subdivided into two sections. The first, x. 1—32, is a brief genealogical notice of the immediate descendants of Noah's sons, comprehending also cer-

tain nations or colonies of which they were the founders.⁴⁷ The historian reverses the order which he elsewhere follows, beginning with Japheth and ending with Shem. He takes particular notice of Nimrod, a grandson of Ham, who, by founding an important monarchy, and, according to the view given of his character by some Eastern historians, by tyrannical and oppressive conduct, acquired a disgraceful and unenviable celebrity. x. 1—9.⁴⁸

The principal cities of his kingdom, and those which were perhaps first established, were Babylon, Edessa, Nesibis, and Ctesiphon,⁴⁹ (the metropolis of Chalontis,) in the country of Babylonia, which must be considered as stretching to a considerable extent. 10. In connexion most probably with the history of Nimrod, is the brief notice of Ashur's emigration from that country, and of his building three cities, the principal of which was Nineveh, 11.⁵⁰ Shem is introduced as the ancestor of the Hebrews, and as the elder brother of Japheth, 21.⁵¹ The division and settlement of the earth are mentioned as contemporaneous with Peleg, and giving rise to his name. 25. His brother Joktan's descendants are then introduced. 26—32.

The second section, xi. 1—9, contains an account of the confusion of the one language, which was employed by all the descendants of Noah. A body of men travelling from the country beyond the Tigris,⁵² settled in the plains of Babylonia, and proposed to build a city and a very lofty tower, with the view of acquiring distinction both among their contemporaries and with posterity, and, by forming themselves into a strong and well guarded community, to prevent their being forcibly dispersed. 1—4.⁵³ It would seem that these men designed to oppose the divine intention, which required mankind to spread themselves in various regions of the earth. But God determines to frustrate their wily project. Should this first enterprise be allowed to

succeed, they will increase in hardy rebellion, and go on unrestrained in wickedness. He resolves to confound their language, and thus, by awakening suspicion of each other, to involve their scheme in utter ruin.⁵⁴ The consequence was, they were widely dispersed; the projected city remained unfinished; and a name was given it, indicating the confusion,⁵⁵ which had been attended with consequences so disastrous to human arrogance. 5—9.

PART VI. CHAP. XI. 10—26.

We have here a list of Shem's descendants in the line from which Abram sprang. This, together with that which is introduced in the fifth chapter, completes the genealogy of the distinguished Hebrew patriarch, whose biography immediately follows.⁵⁶

PART VII. CHAP. XI. 27—XXV. 11.

The sacred writer now presents us with the history of Abraham. The narrative treats of the immediate ancestors of the Hebrew nation, and is therefore more particular and diffuse than that which had preceded it; which is a mere introductory sketch, intended to prepare for the subsequent account. This part begins by mentioning the birth of Abraham, and ends with a notice of his death.

Terah the father of Abram removes with his family⁵⁷ from the land of their nativity, "Ur of the Chaldees," a district lying in the north-eastern part of Mesopotamia, and in modern times reduced to a desolate waste. We are told that their place of destination was the land of Canaan, but that after reaching Haran, a city (or district) situated in the north-western part of Mesopotamia on the Euphrates, they continued there until after the death of Terah.⁵⁸ This removal was made in consequence of a divine direction com-

municated to Abram, which was probably repeated after his father's death.⁶⁰ It was accompanied by a signal benediction, involving, among other promises, the coming of the great descendant of the patriarch, the Messiah, with blessings to be dispensed to all mankind.⁶⁰ Abram obeyed, and he and his party left Haran and went to Canaan. xi. 27—xii. 5.

Entering the land at the north, they gradually advanced towards the south, and were obliged, in consequence of a famine, to take refuge in Egypt. Apprehensive lest the beauty of his wife should induce the Egyptians to put him to death, in order to secure her person, Abram represented her as his sister. Efforts were immediately made by the monarch to procure her as a wife, and with this view the patriarch was treated with great kindness. Some divine inflictions, the nature of which is not stated, most probably led to more particular inquiries; and on ascertaining that the supposed sister of Abram was in reality his wife, she and the whole party were honorably dismissed. 6—20.

On returning into Canaan, the wanderers were obliged to separate into two divisions. They had now become so wealthy, and their flocks so numerous, that it was found impossible to settle in one spot. It is evident, from the tenor of the whole narrative, that the population of Canaan was at this period very sparse. There were indeed several nations already settled in the land, dwelling perhaps in towns and adjacent districts; but much of the open, champain country was still unoccupied. Abram therefore proposed to his kinsman Lot, between whose herdsmen and his own a contention had arisen, probably on the subject of pasturage, to direct his course to whatever region should be agreeable to him, promising that he himself would take another direction. Lot chose the valley of the Jordan, the fertility of which, on account of the abundant supply of water which the river

afforded, is expressed by comparing it to the garden of Eden and to Egypt.⁶¹ The natural advantages of the situation were, however, more than counterbalanced by the depravity and wickedness of the neighboring citizens, whose conduct was habitually distressing to this righteous man. 2 Pet. ii. 7, 8. On the removal of Lot, God renews the promise to Abram, that his posterity should become exceedingly numerous, and possess the country in which he was then migrating. Immediately after this communication, the patriarch fixed his residence in Hebron,⁶² and, "as his manner was," raised an altar to the honor of the Lord. xiii. 1—18.

Certain eastern kings, among whom the king of Persia appears to be the most important,⁶³ wage war against the kings of Sodom and the cities in that vicinity, who had thrown off the yoke that for twelve years had oppressed them. After ravaging the neighboring country,⁶⁴ routing and destroying the inhabitants, they are met by the king of Sodom and his allies, who are defeated in the bituminous valley of Siddim. Lot and his family fall into the hands of the victors, and are carried off as captives. One of the prisoners escaped, and informed Abram of his kinsman's misfortune. Immediately the patriarch armed his people, natives of his own establishment, to the number of three hundred and eighteen,⁶⁵ followed the retreating foe to the northern district of Palestine, divided his party into two bands, routed the victors, pursuing them into Syria, and recovered both the property and the persons that had been seized and carried off. On his return, he was met by the king of Sodom,⁶⁶ and also by Melchisedek. The latter personage was king of a city called Salem, and also a priest of the true God. He brought with him refreshments for Abram and his army, and blessed him in the name of the most high. The patriarch received his benediction and gave him a tenth of the spoils; thus recognizing Melchisedek's superiority and

also his sacerdotal character.⁶⁷ With commendable liberality, the king of Sodom urged Abram to retain the spoils, and return the liberated captives. But the noble generosity of Abram induced him to decline all personal advantage. xiv. 1—24.

After the event just related the divine promise of protection and blessing was renewed to Abram. The patriarch represents to the Lord that he is likely to die childless, and a stranger to inherit his estate.⁶⁸ But the assurance is given him that his own son shall be his heir, and that his posterity shall be countless, like the stars. Abram believed the declaration, however apparently improbable, and was accepted by the Lord as righteous, on account of his faith. xv. 1—6.⁶⁹ At his request, a sign is given him in order to strengthen his confidence in the promise of possessing the land in which he sojourned. He is directed to provide a sacrifice, which he prepares, according to the ordinary and perhaps prescribed usage. Towards sunset, he falls into a deep sleep, accompanied by great distress: he is informed, that his posterity shall reside in a foreign land, and be afflicted four hundred years; that the people whom they were to serve, should be severely punished, while they should be delivered and come out greatly enriched;⁷⁰ that he himself should in very advanced life be taken to his fathers; and that, on the expiration of the fourth age or century,* his descendants should return to Canaan, when the growing iniquity of the inhabitants would require the divine vengeance. 7—16. A smoking furnace and a burning lamp, emblematic perhaps of the afflictions which were to be undergone in Egypt, (compare Deut. iv. 20; Jer. xi. 4,) and of the Almighty's protection, consolation, and guidance, which were to be extended to the sufferers, (compare Isa. lxii. 1; Ps. cxix. 105; Job xxix. 3.)

* See the note in JAHN'S Introduction, p. 212.

passed between the pieces of the victims;⁷¹ the divine promise is renewed, and the whole extent of country, from Egypt⁷² to the Euphrates, is pledged to the posterity of the father of the faithful. 17—21.

As the barrenness of Sarai, Abram's wife, seemed to present an insuperable barrier to the fulfilment of the promise through her, he is induced, by her suggestion, to have intercourse with her Egyptian maid Hagar. Contempt and insolence on the part of the servant were the very natural result; and thus the impropriety of the conduct of Abram and his wife, and the mischievous consequences of polygamy or concubinage, are strikingly illustrated. Sarai's harsh usage led Hagar to leave her mistress, with the view of escaping to her native country. A divine communication directs her to return to the patriarch's family, and promises her a numerous offspring, to descend from the son of whom she is soon to become the mother. A name is given to the yet unborn, indicative of God's regard for his people's affliction. The character by which his race is described, indomitable, though constantly engaged in strife and opposition, aptly applies to the Arabs,⁷³ his lineal descendants; whose residence is also geographically pointed out, as east of that of the Hebrews. xvi. 1—12.⁷⁴ Hagar's grateful recognition of the divine presence and blessing, in appearing to her, and at the same time allowing her the continued use of her bodily senses and vital powers, gives rise to the name of the well or spring at which the divine appearance took place.⁷⁵ Returning to Abram, she no doubt informed him of the particulars of this communication; and, on the birth of the expected son, he called his name Ishmael, (יִשְׁמָעֵאל), God will hear,) in accordance with the prediction made to the mother. 13—16.

This is followed by another divine appearance to Abram, in which the promise is renewed, accompanied by the assur-

ance, that his posterity shall comprehend many nations; an assurance which implies, that true believers of every age and clime shall be regarded as his spiritual children, and be blessed with him. In reference to this, his name is changed into Abraham,⁷⁶ and circumcision is instituted as a sign and pledge of God's covenant,⁷⁷ with the threat of excision denounced against any who should refuse to obey. xvii. 1—14.⁷⁸ A slight change in the name of Abraham's wife, indicative either of a numerous progeny or of some increase of dignity, precedes an emphatic benediction. 15—16. At the promise of a son, various emotions were probably excited in the bosom of the aged patriarch. Joy was doubtless predominant; but it is natural to suppose, that even in faithful Abraham this feeling could not be uniform, and that some degree of distrust would occasionally cloud the bright view opening before his faith. Were it otherwise, he would not be a model of human virtue, but at least of angelic excellence. Hence his expressions of doubt, and his prayer that Ishmael, the child already born, might be the object on whom the divine blessing should descend. 17, 18.⁷⁹ But the promises are to be verified through another son, whose name indicates his parents' joy, and whose birth is to take place a year after. Ishmael indeed is to be blessed with numerous descendants, and with a princely race, but the covenant is to be established with Isaac. 19—22. In his 99th year, Abraham submits to the painful rite of circumcision, and with him all the males of his family, his son Ishmael being thirteen years old. 23—27.

Another divine communication is made to Abraham, under very remarkable and peculiar circumstances. He is sitting, in the heat of the day, at the door of his residence among the oaks of Mamre. Three men make their appearance, to whom he offers his hospitable and respectful attentions. xviii. 1—8. At first, he appears to regard them as travel-

lers, as Lot also did the two angels who afterwards went to Sodom. (See xix. 1 ss., and compare Heb. xiii. 2.) But, at the inquiry for Sarah, and the renewal of the promise of a son by her about the same time in the following year,⁸⁰ he doubtless recognized the celestial nature of his guests.⁸¹ Sarah is reproved for her want of faith, indicated by her laughter; after which the men, as they seemed to be, directed their course towards Sodom, respectfully attended by the patriarch. 9—16. The divine determination to communicate to Abraham the approaching destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, is mentioned as a consequence of his fidelity and obedience. Encouraged by such condescension, he pleads with the Lord as his "friend," (see Isa. xli. 8; James ii. 23,) and secures the promise, that the guilty cities shall be spared, even if they should contain no more than ten righteous persons. 17—33.

In the same evening probably, (compare xviii. 33; xix. 1, 15, 27,) the two angels approach the gate of Sodom, where Lot was sitting. Yielding to his importunity, they enter his house and partake of his hospitality. Perhaps the human appearance which they had assumed was unusually beautiful and attractive, as the vicious inhabitants assault the patriarch's residence for the most atrocious purpose, the execution of which he endeavors to prevent by an offer, which at first view appears scarcely less shocking.⁸² The abandoned wretches become enraged that a mere temporary resident among them should undertake to thwart their views, and they direct their attack against Lot himself. He is rescued from injury by his guests, who secure him in the house, and smite the men without with blindness. xix. 1—11. They then communicate to Lot the purpose of God to destroy the place, and direct him to remove his family and connexions. His sons-in-law disregarded his intreaties; and

the next morning, Lot himself, with his wife and two daughters, urged and assisted by the angels, leave the city and are directed to escape with all possible speed to the mountain district. At the earnest solicitation of Lot, he is allowed to take refuge in Zoar, a small place in the neighborhood, which is saved from the general destruction. 12—22. At sunrise, Lot enters the place of his promised security, and the cities of the plain are entirely destroyed by means of thunder and lightning sent by the Lord.⁶³ The patriarch's wife, too, looking back, and perhaps loitering in the way with the hope of securing some valuable portion of property,* contrary to the divine command, "look not behind thee, neither stay thou in all the plain," (v. 17,) is overtaken by the raging tempest. Suffocated perhaps by the vapor of the sulphur and bitumen, and encrusted by the acrid matter with which the atmosphere was filled, she remained a monument of divine displeasure.⁶⁴

The next morning Abraham's attention is eagerly turned towards the place of his nephew's residence, the destruction of which is but too surely indicated by the volumes of thick smoke that are bursting out. But his piety and prayer had not been forgotten: "God remembered Abraham," and saved Lot. Apprehending, however, a renewal of the calamity, which must make Zoar itself insecure, Lot retreats farther towards the mountains, and takes up his abode in a cave, accompanied by his two daughters. Their incestuous intercourse with him after they had made him intoxicated, results in the birth of two sons, to whom names are given

* The probability of this representation is supported by the words of our Lord in Luke xvii. 30—32. "In the day when the son of man is revealed, he which shall be upon the house top, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away; and he that is in the field, let him likewise not return back. Remember Lot's wife."

which express, though obscurely, their parentage. From these the Moabites and the Ammonites derived their descent. 27—38.⁸⁵

The history now proceeds to relate an incident in Abraham's life, which probably took place some time before.⁸⁶ Removing to the south of Palestine, he settled for a time in Gerar, a city lying in the lower district of Philistia. (See Gen. x. 19, and xxvi. 1.) Here he again represented Sarah as his sister, apprehending that her attractions might lead to his personal injury. Abimelech, the king of the place, took her with the intention of making her his wife; but, obedient to a divine warning communicated to him in a dream, accompanied also by the information, that Abraham was a sacred person who had intercourse with God,⁸⁷ he restored her to her husband. As a mark of respect, he added valuable presents, and offered the patriarch a settlement in any part of his country. The culpable deceit which had been practised on him he reproves, with remarkable delicacy mingled with sarcasm;⁸⁸ and, at the prayer of Abraham, the distress with which his family had been afflicted, was removed. xx. 1—18.⁸⁹

The narrative now resumes its regular order. Sarah becomes mother of a son, whom she calls Isaac, in allusion to the laughter which the promise of his birth had occasioned, and the joy which the event itself produced. (xvii. 17, xviii. 12—15, xxi. 6.) At the age of eight days the child is circumcised; and, at a proper time, he is weaned. As this occasion was attended by unusual festivity, the envy of Ishmael seems to have been excited, and he shows his contempt for his father's legitimate son and favorite by some insulting behaviour.⁹⁰ The jealous Sarah's indignation is roused, and she requires Abraham to dismiss the offender and his servant mother. The patriarch's great reluctance to comply with his wife's request is removed by a divine

communication, directing him to acquiesce, accompanied with the promise that, although his distinguished progeny should descend from Isaac, yet his son by Hagar should become the ancestor of a nation. xxi. 1—13. The next day Hagar and her son are dismissed, and she bends her course towards Egypt. She seems to have lost her way ; for she is represented as wandering in a wilderness. Ishmael, a lad of about thirteen years of age, becomes exhausted, and his unfortunate mother, reduced almost to a state of desperation, places⁹¹ him under one of the small trees, in expectation of his speedy death. But, in the extremity of her affliction, God interposes. He renews his former promise, (xvi. 10,) directs her attention to a spring of water, which she had overlooked, and thus rouses her drooping energies. Hagar and her son take up their residence in the uncultivated region of Paran, on the south of Palestine, (Num. xiii. 3,) and, in due season, she procures him a wife from her native country. 14—21. The chapter concludes by giving an account of a treaty of peace and friendship entered into by Abraham and the Philistine king. It is confirmed by a mutual oath, made at a well, that had been dug by the former, and forcibly seized by the servants of the latter, without his knowledge. It is restored to the rightful owner, who consecrates the spot to the worship of Jehovah. 22—34.

Some time after these transactions, the most remarkable event in the life of Abraham took place. It pleased God to subject him to a severer trial than any which he had himself sustained, or which has ever fallen to the lot of mortals. He is commanded to go to the mountainous country of Moriah,⁹² and there to sacrifice the son of his affection. Certain of the divine origin of the direction, the man, who was already so distinguished for his faith and obedience, complies. Assisted by two of his servants, he prepares wood suitable for the purpose,⁹³ and, without delay, sets out on his

melancholy journey. On the third day he describes the appointed place, and, informing his attendants that he and his son would go some distance further to worship, and then return,⁹⁴ he proceeds to the spot. To the touching question of his son respecting the victim to be offered, he replies by expressing his faith that God would himself provide the sacrifice; and probably he availed himself of this opportunity to communicate the particulars of the divine command.⁹⁵ Isaac submits to the will of God thus expressed, and is just about to perish by his father's hand, when Jehovah's angel interposes and prevents the fatal stroke. A ram, that had become entangled in a thicket, is seized and offered; and a name is given to the place, indicating the Lord's gracious interference in relieving his faithful servants in the severest of trials. xxii. 1—14.⁹⁶ The promise before made to Abraham, of numerous descendants, superior in power to their enemies, and of the blessings which his spiritual progeny, and especially the Messiah, were to extend to all mankind, is again repeated and confirmed in the most solemn manner. Jehovah swears by himself, (comp. Heb. vi. 13, 17,) that such shall be the reward of the patriarch's uncompromising obedience. The whole of this extraordinary transaction being ended,⁹⁷ Abraham returns with his son and attendants, to his residence at Beersheba. 15—19.

The historian now proceeds to mention the offspring of Nahor, no doubt with a particular view to Rebecca, who is soon to appear as Abraham's daughter-in-law. 20—24. He then gives an account of Sarah's death, and of the negotiation with the Hittites for a sepulchre. It is difficult to determine which is most worthy of admiration, the beautiful simplicity of the account, or the noble, benevolent, and truly gentlemanly bearing of both the honorable parties. The field of Machpelah, which lay east of Mamre, is legally secured to the patriarch, and the remains of Sarah are de-

posited in its cave. xxiii. 1—20.⁹⁸ This is followed by the equally simple and interesting narrative of the successful effort to procure a suitable wife for Isaac. Abraham summons his most aged servant, and requires him to swear by a solemn oath not to marry his son to a native of Canaan, but to resort to some member of the family still residing in Mesopotamia. On no consideration is Isaac to settle in that country. The Lord under whose protection he himself has ever lived, will give success to the undertaking. Should, however, the woman applied to decline the offer with the condition of coming to Canaan, the conscientious and venerable servant is released from the obligation of his oath. xxiv. 1—9. The whole deportment of the aged domestic in managing the trust committed to him, is an affecting illustration of his extraordinary worth. Regard for his master's interest and happiness, and the most unaffected and devoted piety to God, are plainly the governing principles by which he is actuated. Arrived at the place of his destination, he stops near evening at a well, and supplicates the God of his master to crown his enterprise with success, and to grant him a particular token to that effect. With devout wonder he is soon made to perceive that his prayer is heard. Rebecca, at the well, refreshes him with a cooling drink, eases the aged man of the labor of drawing water for his camels, and invites him to her father's house. The gratitude of Abraham's servant expands in praise to Abraham's God. 10—28. On the invitation of Laban, the brother of Rebecca, the servant enters the house; but no considerations can induce him to take any refreshment, until he has made known the purpose of his visit. The influence of a kind Providence is too clear to be questioned, and the consent of both father and brother⁹⁹ is given without any hesitation. Rebecca declares herself willing to leave her native land, and to settle in Canaan as the wife of Isaac; and the next

day, with the blessings of her family, she accompanies the faithful messenger. On arriving at Abraham's dwelling, she becomes the wife of Isaac, who shows the respect and affection with which he regarded her, by appropriating for her reception the apartments of his beloved mother. 29—67.

The preceding detailed account is followed by a brief notice of Abraham's marriage to Keturah, by whom he had several children.¹⁰⁰ Probably these and Ishmael¹⁰¹ were apportioned by him in his life-time, and settled in the east, apart from Isaac, the divinely appointed heir. At the age of one hundred and seventy-five the patriarch died, and was buried by his two eldest sons, in the cave which he had purchased from the Hittites. xxv. 1—11.

PART VIII. CHAP. XXV. 12—18.

We have here a list of Ishmael's sons, the twelve princes whose births were before announced to Abraham. xvii. 20. It is followed by a notice of the death of their father, and also of the geographical position of the country in which they lived, east of that afterwards occupied by the Israelites.¹⁰²

PART IX. CHAP. XXV. 19—XXXV. 29.

This part resumes the history of Isaac, and continues it until the period of his death.

The faith of Isaac in the divine promise of numerous offspring was subjected to a long trial. At last, twenty years (comp. xxv. 20 and 26,) after his marriage, Rebecca became pregnant with twins. Agitated and distressed by her situation, she utters her feelings before the Lord. The divine answer informs her, that the children are destined to become

the progenitors of two nations, and that the one which shall descend from the first-born shall be subject to that which is to be derived from his younger brother. The birth of the two children, which takes place soon afterwards, by verifying the former part of the prediction, becomes a pledge of the fulfilment of the latter. The growth of hair which makes the elder remarkable, and unlike ordinary infants, suggests an appropriate name, and the circumstance that his heel was held by the hand of his brother, gives rise to the name of the younger.¹⁰³ Esau became skillful in hunting and out-door exercises, and Jacob was a religious man,¹⁰⁴ without a settled residence. The former was his father's favorite; the latter was the darling of his mother. 19—28. But little is said of the early history of these sons of Isaac. The only fact stated is by no means honorable to either. While Jacob is preparing some vegetable food, of a red color, Esau comes home from the field, exhausted with fatigue, and requests his brother to give him what he is preparing. Jacob requires him to relinquish the privileges of his birth, and under the solemnity of an oath, in which unreasonable demand Esau seems to acquiesce without any hesitation. The food thus dearly purchased is consumed, and "profane" Esau thus despises his birth-right. 29—34.¹⁰⁵

Another famine now arose, obliging Isaac to take up his residence in the country of the Philistines, which, as it lay on the Mediterranean, could the more readily be supplied with the necessaries of life. He is divinely directed not to go to Egypt, and the promise before made to his father is renewed. xxvi. 1—5. During his residence at Gerar, he fell into the same weakness into which his father had twice been betrayed, and represented Rebecca as his sister. His deceit was discovered, and mildly censured by the king, Abimelech, whose character and conduct appear in a very advantageous light. 6—11. The prosperity of Isaac natu-

rally excited the envy of the Philistines, who meanly stopped the wells which his father had opened.* Isaac's increasing greatness is acknowledged by Abimelech, who is thereby induced to request him to leave the country. He complies, and removes out of the immediate vicinity. On opening certain wells, he is obliged to contend with the herdsmen of Gerar more than once. Led by the amiable feeling of concession, he relinquishes his rights; and when, at last, all contention ceases, he perpetuates his gratitude by giving an appropriate name to the well, which his dependants were allowed to use without molestation. 12—22. Hence he removes to Beersheba, and receives another divine promise, which leads him to a public avowal of his religious character. 23—25. This is followed by the notice of a covenant entered into between Isaac and Abimelech, and confirmed by an oath. Hence the name of the place, where the servants of Isaac succeeded in making a well and procuring water, obtains the name of Beersheba, that is, well of the oath. 26—33. This name had been before given to the same place by Abraham, (see xxi. 31, 32.) in allusion both to the *seven* lambs which he had set apart to be received as evidence of his having made the well, and also in reference to the *oath* by which the covenant then made was confirmed.¹⁰⁶ A notice of Esau's marriage with two Hittite women, who made his parents exceedingly unhappy, closes the chapter. 34, 35.

The next contains an account of a crafty project, formed by Rebecca and carried into effect by Jacob, to deceive Isaac, now far advanced in age and incapable of seeing.

* This circumstance is very far from being trifling. In that warm climate it was all important, and particularly for nomad shepherds, to secure an abundant supply of water. A contest about wells, therefore, cannot have been confined to the time of Abraham and Isaac; it must have been of frequent occurrence.

He is overheard directing Esau to procure him some food, such as he was particularly fond of, that after partaking of it, he might bestow on him the paternal benediction. The skillful cunning of the mother contrives to pass off Jacob for Esau; and thus the aged and blind patriarch is led to believe that he is invoking blessings on the elder son, when in fact it is the younger whom he addresses. xxvii. 1—29. Scarcely had he left his father's presence, when Esau makes his appearance with the viands which he had been told to procure, and requests his father to partake and to bless him. The amazement of Isaac shows itself in great agitation; and in broken accents he informs his distressed son, that Jacob had already anticipated him, and taken away the blessing designed for himself. Then, recollecting probably the divine communication which had been made before the birth of the children, that the posterity of the elder should be subject to those of the younger, he adds the emphatic declaration, "yea, and he shall be blessed."¹⁰⁷ Still, this does not prevent the affectionate father from predicting an inferior blessing on his first-born, which was in part verified by the revolt of the Edomites from the control of Judah. 30—40. (See 2 Kings viii. 20—22.¹⁰⁸) Jacob's successful deceit so inflamed the passions of Esau, that he expressed his determination to put him to death, as soon as a decent time of mourning for his father's expected decease should have elapsed. This threat leads the watchful mother to urge on her son the expediency of avoiding the fury of his elder brother, by retiring to the residence of her uncle Laban in Haran.¹⁰⁹ After an interview with his father, who in all probability had become reconciled to the result of the late conduct of his wife and younger son, and who renews in his presence the prayer for the promised blessing, Jacob leaves his native place for Padan-aram, or Mesopotamia, the country of his forefathers. He is allowed to depart without attendants

and as privately as possible, with the view perhaps of avoiding Esau's immediate notice, and in the hope of soothing his exasperated feelings. After the departure of Jacob, his brother, apparently with the view of gratifying his father, married into the family of Ishmael. Pursuing his solitary journey, the travelling exile must have felt his distressful situation. Cut off from the long enjoyed satisfactions of a home, and thrown on the world a stranger and comfortless, it required the same spirit of faith which had distinguished his grandfather, to prevent him from sinking under the burthen of his difficulties. To relieve his anxious mind, the Lord appears to him in a dream; shows him the intimate connexion which subsists between earth and heaven, and that "divine Providence doth govern all things in" both;¹¹⁰ renews the promises made to his father; and adds that of particular protection to himself, with safe return to the land of his birth and inheritance. On awaking, he expresses his deep sense of the solemnity of the place; raises and anoints a monument in commemoration of the fact, giving to the spot the appropriate name of God's house, (Beth-el;) and, by a solemn vow, devotes himself to the Lord, and pledges the tenth of his future property in token of his sincerity. 41—xxviii. 22.¹¹¹

Jacob proceeds on his journey, and arrives at the residence of his parents' family. His uncle Laban receives him with kindness; and, on ascertaining his skill in pastoral affairs, expresses his wish to secure his services. xxix. 1—15. An arrangement agreeable to both parties is immediately made, in consequence of which Jacob becomes an inmate of the family, with the condition of marrying Rachel, the younger of Laban's two daughters, as a compensation for seven years of stipulated service. On the expiration of this period,¹¹² he requires his uncle to ratify the agreement, who cunningly substitutes his less attractive elder daughter Leah

in the place of her sister, who had so long been the object of Jacob's affections. He endeavors to remove his kinsman's dissatisfaction, by pleading the usage of the country not to allow the younger daughter to marry before the elder, at the same time offering to give him Rachel also, at the expiration of a week, in consideration of services which he should render during a second period of seven years. Jacob acquiesces; and, as might be expected, is more attached to the wife of whom he had long been an accepted suitor, than he could possibly be to her unsolicited sister.¹¹³ Through the influence of divine Providence, Leah's unhappiness in the want of her husband's affections is mitigated. She becomes the mother of four sons, to whom she gives names expressive both of her domestic condition, and of her thankfulness. 16—35.¹¹⁴

In the mean time, the favorite wife of Jacob is unblest by any offspring. Influenced by envy and an unconquerable desire to be honored as a mother, she proposes to her husband to take her handmaid Bilhah. To the first son thus born she gives a name, implying that God had espoused her cause; and the second she designates by a term, denoting the struggling efforts by which her attempt to vie with her sister had become successful.¹¹⁵ Her example is imitated by Leah, whose maiden Zilpah also presents Jacob successively with two sons, to whom her mistress gives names significant of her good fortune and happiness. xxx. 1—13.¹¹⁶ The inordinate desire of these women to obtain offspring is strikingly depicted in the account which follows of Reuben's mandrakes, connected with which is the name Issachar,¹¹⁷ which Leah applies to her fifth son. Another son and one daughter are added to her former offspring. 14—21. Afterwards Rachel becomes a mother, and calls her son Joseph, a word implying increase. 22—24.¹¹⁸ At this time Jacob communicates to Laban his intention to

return to the place of his nativity; but his father-in-law is particularly desirous to retain him in his service, and another arrangement is made to that effect. That portion of Laban's cattle which was designated by particular marks, is separated from the rest of the flock; and it is agreed that Jacob shall have, for the reward of his attendance, such of the increase as shall, notwithstanding the separation, be similarly marked. By a stratagem, he contrives to effect such births as would in the greatest degree advance his interests. Thus his own wealth is increased, while that of Laban diminishes. 25—43.

The advancement of Jacob's fortune at the expense of his father-in-law, produced the dissatisfaction which might have been anticipated. Jacob observes it, and is directed to return to Canaan. Aware of the necessity of caution, he holds an interview with his wives in the country, at some distance from their father's residence. He states to them the circumstances of the case: 'that their father's feelings towards him had changed, although he had served him faithfully; that his compensation had been repeatedly altered,¹¹⁹ under the influence of interested motives, deceitfully concealed; that divine Providence had, notwithstanding, protected and blessed him; (compare v. 5, 7, 9;) that, indeed, the very stratagem which he had resorted to did not originate altogether with himself, but was suggested to him in a dream, by the same divine personage to whom he had devoted himself immediately after the communication made to him while on his journey to Mesopotamia. And now, his determination to return to Canaan is made, in consequence of a command issuing from the same divine source.' xxxi. 1—13.¹²⁰ The daughters of Laban acquiesce in their husband's proposal without any hesitation, unscrupulously accusing their father of having treated them unworthily and wronged them. 14—16.¹²¹

After making all necessary arrangements, Jacob and his family leave the country, availing themselves of the occasion of Laban's absence. It was not until three days after, that their flight became known to him. Immediately he pursued the fugitives with highly excited feelings, and overtook them at Mount Gilead. A divine communication to Laban in a dream prevented a directly hostile attack, to attempt which he was no doubt afraid; but he met his son-in-law with an angry expostulation, accompanied by a sarcastic attack on his filial affection, and also a charge of robbery, founded on the fact, (unknown to Jacob,) that Rachel had stolen her father's teraphim. 17—30.¹²² A very careful search having proved fruitless, Jacob addresses his father-in-law in terms of indignant reproach; tells him of the toils and privations which he had undergone in his service; charges him with wickedness and tergiversation; and ascribes his own success to the superintending providence of the God of his fathers. 31—42. Laban's parental feelings are at last moved, and a mutual covenant of peace is proposed, in which Jacob eagerly acquiesces. A monument of stones is erected in attestation, and named by each of the parties respectively in his own native tongue.¹²³ A sacrifice to God, followed by a feast, to which Jacob invites the party of his relative, closes the ceremonies. The next morning, Laban takes an affectionate farewell of his children, and returns to Mesopotamia. 43—55.

Jacob proceeds on his journey, and is met by angels. The design of this meeting was doubtless to console and encourage him, although the brevity of the narrative leaves this to be inferred. As his own party and that of the angels constituted two hosts, (Mahanaim,) he applies this name to the place.¹²⁴ He then sends a respectful message to Esau, to conciliate his favor. On the return of his deputation, he learns that his brother is advancing towards him at the head

of four hundred men ; and, becoming alarmed, immediately takes measures for the safety of a part of his company, at the same time praying for divine protection with characteristic humility and gratitude. In order to omit no act of courtesy which might favorably impress his brother, he prepares a noble present for his acceptance, to be delivered with suitable expressions of inferiority and submission. Still unable to repress the uneasiness that he felt, he rose up at night, with his wives and children, and passed the brook Jabbok, with the view of putting them in a place of greater security. xxxii. 1—23. On this occasion the most remarkable event of his life occurred. He is alone, praying probably for deliverance from the supposed impending danger. A being, apparently human, wrestles with him until day-break. Not prevailing against the hardy Jacob by ordinary effort, he exerts a miraculous power, and the patriarch's thigh is contracted. By this, or some other indication, Jacob recognized the divine character of his opponent, and earnestly implored his blessing. He receives it, and at the same time his name is changed from Jacob to Israel, a term of distinction, implying that he had prevailed over God.¹²⁶ In commemoration of this extraordinary interview, he calls the place Peniel, that is, face of God. As a confirmation of the fact, it is stated, that the Israelites abstain from eating the flesh of the tendon connected with that part of the thigh, out of respect to their great ancestor. 24—32.¹²⁶

The meeting of the two brothers now follows. Jacob approaches Esau with the deepest respect, and is received with the most tender affection. The precautions which he had taken to secure the safety of those who were dearest to him, appear to have been unnecessary, as the kindest feeling pervades the breast of his brother, who seems to have forgotten former wrongs, and to have yielded to the natural impulses of a heart overflowing with affection. The pre-

sent¹²⁷ which Jacob had prepared is at first kindly refused, but, on his urgent solicitation, is at last accepted. After a fraternal offer of protection, which Jacob declines as unnecessary, Esau departs for his own country. Jacob travels in another direction,¹²⁸ and arrives safely at Shalem,¹²⁹ where he fixes his residence on land which he had purchased. In the manner of his religious father and grandfather, he erects an altar in honor of the God of Israel. xxxiii. 1—20.¹³⁰

The narrative now relates an unhappy event in the life of Dinah, Jacob's only daughter, which has an important influence on the patriarch's arrangements, and also on the future destiny of two of his sons. Shechem, the lord of that part of the country in which Jacob had settled, seduces Dinah, and is desirous to marry her. Her brothers were at the time from home, superintending their flocks. Being informed of the circumstance on their return, they are indignant at the dishonor which Shechem's folly had brought on their father and family,¹³¹ and determine to avenge the disgrace. In order to ensure the accomplishment of their purpose, they receive the communication of the young prince and Hamor his father with apparent satisfaction, acquiescing in the proposal made for the hand of their sister, which required that Shechem and his people should submit to be circumcised. The father and son agreed to the terms; and, by a favorable representation of the advantages to be derived by forming connexions with the family of a man so wealthy and honorable as Jacob, they prevail on their people to consent to the unpleasant condition.¹³² When the inconvenience resulting from the operation was most oppressive, and incapacitated the Shechemites for active exertion, two of Dinah's maternal brothers, Simeon and Levi, at the head most probably of their armed dependants, attacked and put to death the unsuspecting people, with Hamor and his son, spoiled their city, seized their property, and delivered

the injured daughter of Jacob. When the patriarch severely remonstrates with them on the criminality of their conduct, they attempt to vindicate or palliate it by the infamy which the treatment of the prince had brought on their sister. xxxiv. 1—31.

God now commands Jacob to remove to Bethel. He obeys, after having purified his household from the remains of superstition and idolatry which still clung to some of its members. A panic terror, induced by divine Providence, seizes the inhabitants of the neighboring cities, and prevents them from avenging on his sons the slaughter of the Shechemites.¹³³ On arriving at Bethel, he builds an altar, and designates the place by the name which he had before given it, prefixing also the name of God.¹³⁴ The death and burial of Rebecca's nurse is mentioned, in order, most probably, to explain to the Israelites the origin of the name of an oak subsisting in their time, rather than from the importance of the circumstance itself, as Rebecca's own death is passed over unnoticed. xxxv. 1—8. Then follows an account of another divine communication, renewing promises before made and the previous change of the patriarch's name. He commemorates the event by setting up a stone pillar, with religious rites. 9—15. The narrative then mentions the death of Rachel, which took place some distance¹³⁵ from Ephrath or Bethlehem, on occasion of the birth of Benjamin;¹³⁶ also another removal of Jacob, and the infamous conduct of his eldest son.* Then follows a list of his sons, all of whom but one were born in Mesopotamia.¹³⁷ This

* The sacred writer most probably introduces this disgraceful transaction to prepare his reader for the father's severe yet just denunciation contained in xlix. 3, 4. It would seem, therefore, to intimate the unity of plan which pervades the whole book, and is most consistent with the theory that it was composed by one author.

part closes by an account of the age and death of Isaac, who was buried by his two sons. 16—29.

PART X. CHAP. XXXVI.

This chapter is closely connected with the preceding and subsequent chapters. At the end of xxxv, it is said of Isaac, that "his sons Esau and Jacob buried him." This is followed in the present chapter by a genealogical statement of Esau's descendants, concluding with, "this is Esau, the father of the Edomites;" immediately after which, in chapter xxxvii, we have an account of Jacob's family.*

Without interrupting the subsequent history of this family, a brief account of the descendants of Esau is here given. First, his wives are enumerated.¹³⁸ This is succeeded by a notice of his sons, and of his removal to Seir, which leaves the land of Canaan for the family of his brother. Each of these countries was occupied by the descendants of Jacob and Esau respectively, agreeably to divine direction. Esau gathered all his effects which he had acquired in Canaan, and went into another land,¹³⁹ away from his brother Jacob. This suggests the reason of the procedure. Lot had settled in Sodom, leaving Canaan to Abram, xiii. 12; Ishmael and other sons of Abraham had been removed to the east, xxv. 6. Esau now abandons the promised land to his brother, to whom it of right belonged. The immediate occasion of this arrangement is said to be the great pastoral wealth of the parties, their cattle being too numerous for the limited pastures, which the condition of the country allowed them to

* It would seem difficult to persuade one's self that more than one author was engaged in the composition of these chapters. If there were, the compiler must have performed his task with extraordinary ability, so happy is the combination of originally unconnected fragments which he must be supposed to have made.

occupy. It is to be considered, that the Canaanitish tribes were now very considerable, and that the patriarchal families required great extent of country, on account of the multitude of their cattle, and also of their nomad habits. xxxvi. 1—8. Then follows a list of Esau's descendants for a few generations, 9—19, he himself now appearing as the father of a tribe; and also of Seir's, the former possessor of the country, 20—30.¹⁴⁰ A consecutive catalogue of the kings that reigned in Edom before the institution of royal authority over the Israelites, and a list of certain dukes, complete the chapter. 31—43.¹⁴¹

PART XI. CHAP. XXXVII. 1—L.

This last part of the book of Genesis contains the subsequent history of Jacob's family until the death of Joseph.¹⁴²

This was the patriarch's favorite child, and the parent's partiality seems to have shown itself injudiciously, both in the peculiar attire in which he dressed the youth, and in allowing him to make unfavorable reports of his elder brothers. The father's undue fondness for this son excited the jealousy of the others, and their dislike was increased by two dreams of his which he communicated to them, and which plainly indicated his future superiority over the whole family.¹⁴³ These dreams made a strong impression on the mind of the patriarch, although he thought proper to censure his son for the extraordinary self-importance which they seemed to imply. At the age of seventeen, Joseph was sent to inquire after the welfare of his brothers, who were some distance from home attending their flocks. On his approach they resolve to kill him, but at the instance of Reuben, who wishes to secure his safety in order to deliver him to his father, he is put into a pit. During Reuben's absence, a party of Ishmaelites¹⁴⁴ pass along on their

way to Egypt, and at the proposal of Judah, Joseph is sold to them. His coat is then dipped in blood, and a fraud is practised upon Jacob, who is led to believe that his favorite had been devoured by some wild beast. In the mean while Joseph is taken to Egypt, and sold to Potiphar, one of the king's officers. xxxvii.

The contents of the next chapter seem to have no immediate connexion with the preceding or subsequent, the history of which appears to be thereby unexpectedly interrupted. If the conduct of Judah with respect to Tamar, which is the principal point in the account, were contemporaneous with the sale of Joseph, this may explain the reason of its introduction in this place. But it seems very difficult to reconcile such a synchronism with dates mentioned in other parts of the history.¹⁴⁵ Judah's failure to perform his promise to his daughter-in-law Tamar, by marrying her to his son Shelah,¹⁴⁶ induces her to perpetrate a shameful and wicked deceit, which is followed by the birth of her twin sons, of whom Judah is the father. xxxviii.

The excellent conduct of Joseph, and the prosperity which attended all his efforts to advance his master's interests, led Potiphar to make him superintendent over his family, and to resign to him all his concerns.¹⁴⁷ The beauty of Joseph's person attracting the attention of his mistress, subjected him to repeated solicitations, the virtuous rejection of which induced her to calumniate him to her husband, and was thus the occasion of his imprisonment. (See Gen. xl. 3, 4, the latter of which texts seems to imply that Potiphar had become satisfied of Joseph's innocence.) But the favor which divine Providence had already shown him is still continued, and alleviates the sufferings of confinement. The keeper of the prison commits the care of its inmates to the faithful Joseph, in whose hands every thing is made to prosper. xxxix.¹⁴⁸

At this time two of the king's officers are imprisoned, and put under the supervision of Joseph. After having been some time in confinement, each of them has on the same night a remarkable dream,¹⁴⁹ adapted to the nature of his office in the court. Joseph explains the dreams, and in the course of three days, as he had foretold, the event realized the interpretation.¹⁵⁰ One of the officers is put to death, and the other restored to his former station.

xl. Two years afterwards Pharaoh himself has a very extraordinary dream; and this is succeeded by another, which, in its main points, bears a striking resemblance to the former. These repeated dreams, so peculiar in their character, disturb the monarch's mind. He feels that they must forebode something unusual, and endeavors to obtain satisfaction from the magicians and wise men of Egypt, who affected to be able to penetrate into futurity. But in vain. The meaning of the dreams lies beyond the reach of their keenest sagacity. In this dilemma, the officer who had been restored to his place, agreeably to the interpretation of his dream as given a long time before by Joseph, remembers the Hebrew captive, and relates to Pharaoh the whole account of himself and his unfortunate brother-officer, with the successful interpretation of their respective dreams. Joseph is immediately sent for, and after modestly disclaiming any ability of his own to satisfy the royal mind, and referring to the omniscient God as the only source of knowledge, the dreams are made known to him by Pharaoh. He then informs the king that both indicate the same thing; that seven years of extraordinary plenty are to be followed by as many of extraordinary scarcity; and that the repetition of the dreams denotes the certainty and speedy accomplishment of the prediction. He also suggests to Pharaoh certain measures proper to be taken in order to preserve the people, during the time of the famine which is

to waste the country. xli. 1—36. Pharaoh shows how strong an impression the advice of this prudent counsellor had made on his mind, by appointing him general superintendent over Egypt, inferior only to himself. He accompanies this dignity with suitable external marks of honor,¹⁵¹ gives Joseph an Egyptian name, expressive of the great benefits which were received from him as the saviour of their lives, (comp. xlvii. 25,)¹⁵² and raises him to the highest of the national castes, by marrying him to a daughter of the priest of Heliopolis, the city of the sun, as the Egyptian word *On* signifies. 37—45. Joseph immediately enters on the duties of his office, and secures the surplus grain during the seven exceedingly prolific years. In the mean time, he becomes the father of two sons, to whom he gives names expressive of the happy change which, by the blessing of Providence, had taken place in his condition. 46—52.

Now come the predicted years of famine. The neighboring nations apply to Egypt for food; and Jacob's sons, with the exception of Benjamin, the father's darling, present themselves before the great lord of Egypt, and make the most respectful obeisance to "the dreamer," whom they had "sold for a servant." He immediately recognizes them as his unworthy brothers. But too well acquainted with their real characters, he knew that it was expedient to exercise some degree of harshness towards them as a wholesome discipline. They presented themselves before him, without his father's favorite, his own beloved Benjamin. The suspicion was probably awakened in his bosom, that this only other son of his mother had, like himself, been subjected to unworthy treatment, perhaps had come to an untimely end. Their treachery towards himself he had doubtless long since forgiven; but it became him to take measures in order to ascertain his brother's condition. With the view of satisfying himself on this point the more readily, he per-

sonates the stranger. He accuses them of being spies, and puts them in prison. On the third day, he releases them from confinement, and retaining Simeon, who was probably one of the most cruel of the band, (see xlix. 5,) as a hostage, he dismisses the others, with provision for their families, commanding them at the same time to bring to him their youngest brother, and thus to clear themselves of the charge which he had brought against them. On returning to Jacob, and giving him an account of their reception in Egypt, of the retention of Simeon, and the demand for Benjamin, the patriarch's distress is greatly aggravated. The money of each one being found carefully secured in his respective sack,¹⁵³ adds to the prevalent distress. As a circumstance, strange and unaccountable, perhaps it awakened alarm in their guilty consciences, although they knew not why; perhaps also it suggested a seemingly well founded apprehension of increased danger to Simeon. The anguish which must have been felt both by parent and sons, is most strikingly depicted, by the frenzied proposal which Reuben makes to his father, to allow him to take Benjamin to Egypt, and if he did not bring him back, to "slay" his own "two sons"; in other words, to avenge the loss of his favorite by destroying two of his grandchildren! In such a state of mind, rational propositions were hardly to be expected. The language of the overwhelmed patriarch as strikingly portrays the depth of his affection for the lost Joseph and his younger brother; "my *son* shall not go down with you, for *his brother* is dead, and he is left *alone*." 53—xlii.

But necessity knows no law. The famine increases; the supply of corn is consumed; and Jacob proposes a second application to Egypt. Judah wrings from him a reluctant consent that Benjamin shall accompany them. With a small present, consisting of the best productions of the ground, which circumstances allowed them to procure, and which

were usually imported to Egypt in the way of trade, (see xxxvii. 25,) and with twice the sum necessary to pay for the expected provision, Joseph's brothers again make their appearance in Egypt. Now, having substantiated the truth of their former statements, they are treated with kindness and distinction; they are brought to the house of the governor, who finds it impossible to restrain the overflowings of fraternal affection for Benjamin, his mother's son, and is obliged to retire in private to give vent to his feelings. The order of the entertainment which follows is doubtless directed by Joseph. He, his brothers, and his Egyptian guests, are separately served, in order that the prejudices of the latter should not be offended;¹⁵⁴ and, to the surprise and perplexity of the Hebrew party, they are arranged according to seniority. Agreeably to usage, the master of the feast sends portions to each of his company, and the affectionate brother avails himself of the occasion to show his regard for Benjamin, by sending him five times as much as any one of the others. xliii.

It must be evident to every reflecting reader, that it is Joseph's intention to make himself known to his brethren. Before doing so, however, he thinks it best to discover their sentiments and feelings toward Benjamin, in order to ascertain whether the same unkind jealousies which had marked their conduct towards himself, now influenced their treatment of his brother. He directs his steward to return the money as before, and, in addition, to put his own cup into Benjamin's sack. Some time after the men had been dismissed, the steward is sent in pursuit, and severely expostulates with them on the ingratitude of their conduct, and also on the folly of it, representing the moral certainty of detection.¹⁵⁵ The accusation of theft is repelled with a feeling of conscious innocence. If the cup shall be found in the possession of any one, they do not hesitate to condemn him to

death and themselves to bondage. The examination results in finding it in the sack of Benjamin; and, in utter confusion and dismay, the party return to the city. With the deepest humiliation, Judah, who evidently supposes the theft to have been committed, acknowledges their crime, and offers himself and his brothers as servants. With an apparently strict regard to justice, Joseph refuses to retain in bondage any but the offender himself. He permits the others to return to their father. This is followed by the most touching address of Judah, who remembers the "bereavement" which his father had felt in parting with Benjamin, and is aware that the retention of this beloved child must bring down the parent's "gray hairs with sorrow to the grave." The simplicity, the tenderness, the exquisite pathos of the expostulation which flows warm from the heart of Judah, make it as a composition altogether inimitable. Any attempt to analyse it must be a failure. He begs the privilege of being substituted as a bondsman in the place of his younger brother, and that "the lad," whose return is essential to the life of the worn-out old man, may be permitted to return to his bosom. It was impossible to resist such an appeal, "and Joseph wept aloud." Dismissing his Egyptian attendants, he tells his brethren who he is, consoles them in the distress which the declaration occasioned, by reminding them that divine Providence had superintended and controlled the remarkable events of his life, with a view to the general good. He directs them to hasten to his father with the joyous intelligence that "God had made him lord of all Egypt," and with an urgent request to come and settle there with his family. Natural and appropriate manifestations of affection accompany the disclosure, and the confidence of his brothers is somewhat restored. The intelligence of the arrival of Joseph's brothers is received by Pharaoh with pleasure, and the grateful monarch reiterates the request of his prime

minister, and makes liberal provision for the journey of Jacob's family. Another illustration of Joseph's fondness for Benjamin shows itself in a generous donation; and he dismisses his brothers, either with encouragement not to distress themselves with apprehensions of evil, or else with exhortation not to make themselves uneasy by mutual recrimination. The original word *יִרְחֹקוּ*, may be understood so as to imply either of those senses. xliv. 1—xlv. 24.

On returning, they communicate to their father the intelligence of Joseph's being still alive and ruling over Egypt. At first the good tidings are too joyful to be credited, and when the patriarch is satisfied of the truth of his children's account, it is the fact that his dear son is still living to which his heart responds: the attendant dignities and honors are overlooked. "Joseph, my son, is yet alive: I will go and see him before I die." This resolution is sanctioned by a divine direction, and the patriarch, with all his family,¹⁵⁶ settles in the land of Egypt. Joseph meets him in Goshen,¹⁵⁷ and afterwards presents five of his brothers and then his father to Pharaoh, with whom he makes arrangements for the future residence of the family in that district. xlv. 25—xlvii. 12.

As the distress occasioned by the scarcity of food increases, Joseph continues to supply the wants of the Egyptians, by selling them provisions until their money is exhausted, after which they barter their cattle, and at last surrender their property and themselves to the monarch. The people in general are removed from their respective places of residence, and so disposed as best to secure national quiet or temporary convenience.¹⁵⁸ The regulations established by Joseph either restored the property thus purchased to the former owner, or granted him a portion elsewhere, on the condition that one-fifth of the produce should be paid to the king. This became a permanent law of the land. The

property of the priests, however, who were supported during the famine by Pharaoh, was expressly excluded from this arrangement. 13—26.

The settlement of the Israelites in the fertile region which had been assigned them, was marked by advancing prosperity and increase. Nevertheless, a permanent residence in Egypt, the most distinguished probably among the flourishing countries of the ancient world, and therefore in point of secular advantages the most desirable, was far from the thoughts of the venerable Jacob. He remembered the promises made to his fathers and renewed to himself, that their posterity should possess the land of Canaan; he could not have been unacquainted with the prediction, that they were to reside under afflictive circumstances among a foreign people, and in the end to be restored to the promised country. (xv. 13—16.) Calling to mind the extraordinary interpositions of divine Providence in favor of his family; confidently relying on the fidelity of his almighty protector; and, probably, regarding the temporal blessings announced in the promise as emblematic of those spiritual and everlasting joys, which God hath prepared for those who love and trust him; he requires of Joseph, with the solemnity of an oath, not to inter him in Egypt, though famous for the seemingly imperishable character of its mausoleums, but to bury him with his fathers in the land of Canaan. Assured of being gratified in this wish of faith, the venerable patriarch vents the feelings of his gratitude in devout thanksgiving. 27—31.¹⁵⁹

After this Jacob is taken sick, and visited by his favorite son, who is accompanied by his two children, Manasseh and Ephraim. After recounting the appearance of God to him in Canaan, and his promise to bless him and his posterity, Jacob formally adopts the two boys, placing them in the same rank, and entitling them to the same privileges and

patrimonial inheritance as his own children. The sight of the beloved Joseph awakens in his bosom the feelings of affection which he had never ceased to cherish for his lamented Rachel, and he touches on the circumstances of her death and burial. The verse (7,) which contains this stroke of conjugal tenderness, does indeed interrupt the connexion of the patriarch's leading thought. The coldness of affected criticism finds here an interpolation; but it is nature itself that bursts out with the interruption, and the mouth does but pour forth somewhat of the abundance of the heart. It is a solemn moment of sublime religious emotion. The heart is full of chastened love. "I had not thought to see the face; and lo, God hath showed me also thy seed." 'What a mercy to grant such an end to long endured anguish for a son so tenderly beloved! O, that she, so early snatched away, could see with me this joyous sight!' Passing from the fond recollection of scenes now gone forever, to what was then transpiring, and so on to events which still lay hid in a remote futurity, he requires his two grandsons to be brought to him. After affectionately embracing them, and again expressing his devout gratitude, he laid his right hand on the head of his younger grandson, and his left on that of the elder, although the position in which their father had placed them must have required him to cross his arms,¹⁶⁹ and thus to assume a posture somewhat unnatural. The dimness of the patriarch, in consequence of his advanced age, prevented him from distinguishing the elder from the younger, so that this adjustment, which the subsequent prediction shows was not incidental, must have originated in a divine superintending influence. Joseph was well aware that the position of his father's hands intimated the degree of the predicted benefaction, and he would have placed the right hand on the head of Manasseh, his eldest son. But the aged seer, who was better acquainted with the analogy

of the divine procedure, and with the determination of Providence respecting the two brothers, refused to alter the arrangement which he had designedly made. While he gave his prophetic blessing to both the brothers, he plainly announced that the posterity of the younger should be the more numerous, and become a greater people than that which should descend from the elder. Both, however, should be considered as the sons of Israel, whose name they were to bear; and the angel who supported the father through all the diversified scenes of his life, and delivered him from the various dangers which so often threatened his destruction, is invoked, evidently as a divine being, to bless the adopted children.¹⁶¹ The interview is closed by another expression of faith on the part of Jacob, that God would restore his family to the land of their fathers' pilgrimage, and by the notice of a donation of a particular piece of ground to Joseph, which his father had forcibly wrested from the Amorites. xlviii.¹⁶²

Now follows the celebrated blessing of Jacob,¹⁶³ which he announced before his death in the presence of his sons.*

‘And Jacob called to his sons; and he said, gather yourselves together, and I will declare to you what shall befall you in future times. Collect yourselves and attend, ye sons of Jacob, attend to Israel your father.

REUBEN, my first-born art thou,

My might, and the beginning of my strength,
Chief in excellence, and chief in might.

Lascivious, like water, thou shalt not be chief,

* As this portion is particularly interesting and important, I trust that a translation of the whole of it, accompanied by notes more extensive than those usually employed in this work, will not be unacceptable.¹⁶⁴

Because thou ascendedst the bed of thy father,

Then didst thou pollute it:—

He ascended my couch!

SIMEON and LEVI are brethren;

Instruments of violence are their swords.

In their secret council enter not, my soul,

In their assembly do not join, my heart,

For in their anger they slew men,

And in their wantonness they destroyed a city.

Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce,

And their wrath, for it was cruel;

I will disperse them among Jacob,

And will scatter them among Israel.

JUDAH! thy brethren will praise thee.

Thy hand shall strike the backs of thine enemies;

The sons of thy father shall bow down before thee,

A lion's whelp is Judah;

From the prey, my son, thou hast gone up!

He bent, couched down like a lion,

And like a roaring lion:

Who will rouse him!

Authority shall not depart from Judah,

Neither shall he want a law-giver,

Until he comes to whom it is,

And him the nations shall obey.

He fastens to the vine his ass's foal,

And to the choice vine the son of his ass:

He washes in wine his garments,

And in the blood of grapes his vesture.

Sparkling are his eyes with wine,

And white are his teeth with milk.

ZEBULON will dwell on the sea-coast.

A coast well lined with ships;

His territories reach unto Zidon.

ISSACHAR is a strong ass,

Lying down within his borders.

And he saw that rest was good,

And that the land was fair ;

And he offered his shoulder to bear the burden,

And became a tributary.

DAN will rule his people,

Like one of the tribes of Israel.

Dan will be a serpent in the road,

An adder in the path,

That biteth the heels of the horse,

And his rider falls backward.

For thy deliverance have I waited,

O Jehovah !

GAD, a troop may press upon him,

But he shall press in the end.

From ASHER, rich shall be his food,

And he shall yield royal delicacies.

NAPHTALI is a hind let loose ;

He giveth discourses of beauty.

A fruitful scion is JOSEPH,

A fruitful scion at a well,

The branches shoot over the wall.

The archers distressed him,

They shot at him, and hated him ;

But his bow continued strong,

And his arms were active,

By the hands of the mighty one of Jacob,

By the name of the shepherd, the stone of Israel,

By the God of thy father, who will help thee,

And the Almighty, who will bless thee,

With blessings of heaven above,

Blessings of the deep which lieth below,

Blessings of the breasts and of the womb.

The blessings of thy father exceed the blessings of the perpetual mountains,

The desirable things of the eternal hills ;

They shall come upon the head of Joseph,

And upon the crown of the noblest among his brethren.

BENJAMIN is a wolf, he tears in pieces ;

In the morning he devours the prey,

And at evening he divides the spoil.' xlix. 1—27.

After uttering this prophetic benediction relating to the future circumstances of his children's posterity, the patriarch charges all his sons together, to bury him with his fathers in the land of Canaan. Then, having no other communication to make, he calmly surrenders his soul to him that gave it, "and is gathered unto his people." 28—33.

The tokens of Joseph's filial affection are followed by directions to have his father's body embalmed. The ceremonies of mourning in Egypt being ended, Joseph obtains permission of Pharaoh to attend the remains of his father to the place of interment in Canaan, agreeably to the oath which he had sworn. Having arrived at the threshing floor of Atad, which was no doubt some place east of the Jordan,¹⁶⁵ well fitted for the purpose intended, the lamentation is renewed, and so marked is its character, that it gives rise to the name by which the place was afterwards distinguished. This second mourning being ended, the obsequies of his venerated parent are suitably performed, and the body deposited in the spot so solemnly agreed on. Joseph and his company return to Egypt. l. 1—14.

His brothers, apprehensive lest the decease of their father should have removed the only restraint which could have prevented Joseph from resenting their injurious treatment, sent a messenger to him, deprecating his anger in the most affecting language, and then went themselves with the

numblest acknowledgments. His reply is such as might have been expected from an affectionate and forgiving brother, who recognized the hand of divine Providence in the most distressful events of his life. 15—21. The account of Joseph's death at the age of one hundred and ten years, surrounded by his family, and avowing the same faith by which his ancestors had been distinguished, closes the book. 15—26.

NOTES TO GENESIS.

PART I. CHAP. I.—II. 3.

(1.) SOME critics divide the work into nine parts, considering the sixth as the commencement of the seventh, and the eighth as an appendix to it. But the history of Abraham, which is so very prominent a part of the book of Genesis, ought to be made a distinct portion. I have therefore thought it best to separate the genealogical list of Shem's descendants from the subsequent more minute and particular narrative, and to make the brief notice of Ishmael's family in xxv. 12—18, a distinct division, to which it seems to have as just a claim as the account of Esau's descendants in xxxvi.

(2.) Comp. v. 14—17. The phrase "heaven and earth," v. 1. ii. 1, expresses the universe. See Gen. xiv. 19, 22. Sometimes, indeed, other terms are added; but this is done for the sake of emphasis or graphical effect. Thus we find the language, "the heavens and the earth and the sea and the dry land." See Hag. ii. 6, where the representation is figurative, and explained by the phrase "all nations" in the next verse; also Ex. xx. 11, which is literal, "the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is."

(3.) In favor of the former view, the analogy of the book may be pleaded, every other division having its own proper introduction. But it may be replied, that the introductions to the other divisions are evidently inscriptions, while this

appears to be a historical statement of what first took place, followed by a continuous account of subsequent transactions. The words in ii. 3, 'which God created in making,' בָּרָא לַעֲשׂוֹת would undoubtedly agree with that view, as לַעֲשׂוֹת no doubt refers to the continuous narrative before given. But this can hardly be considered as decisive, for בָּרָא in i. 1, may be used in the sense of originally creating, while in ii. 3, in connexion with לַעֲשׂוֹת, it may denote the perfection of that original creation by the proper formation and regular adjustment of the materials; just as a city is said to be built, when the meaning is, that it is only rebuilt and beautified. The exposition under consideration seems to be supported by the use of בָּרָא in ii. 4, where it implies formation and arrangement. Thus also in Isa. xlv. 18, the prophet evidently refers to the language in Genesis: 'thus saith the Lord, creator בּוֹרֵא of the heavens; he, the God that forms the earth and makes it; he establishes it; he did not create it confusion, he formed it to be inhabited,' לֹא-תִהְיֶה בְּרָאָה לְשֶׁבֶת וְיִצְרָה. Here the word בָּרָא, so far from being used to express the act of calling into existence a chaotic mass, is evidently synonymous with יָצַר and עָשָׂה, and denotes such a creation as produces arrangement and accommodation for inhabitants.

The latter view cannot be maintained on the ground that בָּרָא means to create in the sense of giving existence to, for this, as has been just seen, is by no means its necessary sense. The word בְּרֵאשִׁית may seem to support this view, as in Prov. viii. 22, it is used without the preposition, to express a period anterior to the formation of the world, as is the corresponding word מְרֹאשׁ in the same chapter, v. 23. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning, רֵאשִׁית, of his way;" "from the beginning, מְרֹאשׁ, or even the earth was:" lite-

rally, 'from before the earth.' But the nature of the subject in Proverbs, which is a truly poetic and beautiful personification of divine wisdom, and the immediate context, favor the opinion that these terms denote eternity; and if so, they are inapplicable to the verse before us. It has been thought that a clear sense is given to this clause by supposing an ellipsis to be supplied from what follows, thus: 'in the beginning of things, when nothing had yet been created.' So BUDDÆUS, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, Halæ Magdeb. 1719, 4to. Tom. I. p. 65. But it is plain that the question under consideration is not hereby settled; because, if this ellipsis be allowed, it still remains to be determined, whether the creating referred to denotes the original production of things, or their formation and arrangement. If the former be the true meaning, the sense of the verse and its connexion with what follows, are evidently as follows: 'At first God caused material substances to exist, which being, or becoming, in a state of confusion and disorder, he afterwards formed into a harmonious and well arranged creation.'

Another view of this place presumes the previous calling into existence of the mass of matter, and considers the first verse with part of the second as descriptive of its condition immediately before the creation, the account of which then follows. This is given by Rabbi Solomon Jarchi,* who maintains that the construct usage of בְּרֵאשִׁית requires some such connexion. After giving some far-fetched and extravagant allusions of earlier writers, founded in national vanity, he proceeds thus: **וְאֵם בָּאת לְדַרְשׁוֹ כַּפְשׁוֹ כֵּן פִּרְשׁוּהוּ בְּרֵאשִׁית בְּרִיית שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ וְהָיְתָה תוֹרוֹ וּבִוְהוֹ וְחֹשֶׁךְ וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהי אוֹר וְלֹא בֹא הַמִּקְרָא**

* This commentator is more usually denominated Rashi, רִשִּׁי, which is a technical word formed from the initial letters of the above appellation.

להורות סדר הבריאה לומר שאלו קדמו שאם בא להורות כך היה לו לכתוב בראשונה ברא את השמים וגו' שאין לך ראשית במקרא שאינו דבוק לתיבה של אחריו כמו בראשית ממלכת יהויקים ראשית ממלכתו ראשית דגנך אם כאך אתה אומר בראשית ברא אלהים את השמים וגו' כמו בראשית ברוא ודומה לו תחילת דבר יי' בהושע כלומר תחילת דבורו של הקב"ה בהושע ויאמר יי' אל 'But if you wish to explain the words according to their simple meaning, explain them thus: 'in the beginning of the creating of the heavens and the earth, then the earth was without form, and void and darkness, and God said, let there be light.' The verse does not intend to show the arrangement of the creation, saying that these" (that is, the heavens and the earth,) "were first. If it had been the author's intention to state this, he would have written בראשונה ברא 'את השמים וגו' (that is, he would have employed the word בראשונה and not בראשית.) "For ראשית never occurs in Scripture except in connexion with a following word," (that is, in the construct state,) "as we find it in the following places: 'in the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim'; 'the beginning of his reign'; 'the beginning of thy corn.'* So in this place you should read, 'in the beginning

* The general usage of ראשית is construct, as Rashi says. But he is mistaken in supposing that it is never found otherwise. In Levit. ii. 12, we have קרבן ראשית וקריביו אתם ליהוה "the oblation of the first fruits ye shall offer them unto the Lord;" in Deut. xxxiii. 21, וַיֵּצֵא רֵאשִׁית לֹו "and he provided the first part for himself;" in Neh. xii. 44, לְרֵאשִׁית וְלַמַּעֲשֹׂרוֹת "for the first fruits and for the tithes;" and in Isa. xlv. 10, מִיְּבִיד מֵרֵאשִׁית אַחֲרִית, "declaring the end from the beginning." But these, I believe, are the only places in which ראשית is used, not in construction with the following word, although it occurs very often in the Hebrew Bible; and it is possible, that in the first three of these, it may be in the construct with a subsequent word understood.

of God's creating the heavens, &c.,' as if the Hebrew were **בראשית ברא** in the beginning of creating. Similar to this is, (Hos. i. 2.) **תְּהַלֵּלְתָּ דְּבַר-יְהוָה בְּהוֹשִׁיעַ**, that is to say, the beginning of God's speaking by Hosea; and the Lord said to Hosea, &c."

A very particular account of the various opinions, Jewish and Christian, respecting the words **בְּרָא בְּרֵאשִׁית** may be found in GATAKER'S *Adversaria Miscellanea*, Lib. II. cap. i. ii.

(4.) The idea conveyed by the original words is evidently that of confusion and desolation, as they are used in Job xii. 24, Isa. xxxiv. 11, xlv. 18, Jer. iv. 23. The ancient versions agree in this meaning. *Ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασχεύαστος*, in the Septuagint, refers either to the mass being overflowed by water and consequently not to be seen, or rather to its wild, confused appearance, making it unfit to be looked at. The descriptions throughout the chapter are evidently prepared in reference to a supposed observer, who watches the changes until the wild and desolate confusion gives place to a world of perfect order and harmony.

(5.) The figure is taken from the hovering and brooding of birds over their young, in which sense the word is used also in the Syriac. Hence the old mystic representation of the world under the figure of an egg may have been derived. See VOSSIUS *de Origine et Progressu Idolatriæ*, Lib. I. cap. v. p. 33, 34. edit. Amsterd. 4to. 1642.

(6.) It must be evident to the most inattentive reader, that, in common with other parts of the Bible, this account abounds with figurative language. It is simple, but still poetic. God is represented as commanding the various creations to take place, where the author undoubtedly in-

tended to express the idea that they sprang forth in compliance with his will and by the exertion of his power.

(7.) The Hebrew term for heaven is derived from the Arabic *سَـ*, to be high.—The word *רָקִיעַ* is rendered by some “expanse,” a sense which suits the context, and also the etymological meaning of the verb *רָקַע* to expand, beat out. The common translation, “firmament,” agrees with that of the Septuagint, *σπερμα*, and of the vulgate, “firmamentum,” and is perhaps preferable. If this be the writer’s meaning, it will not follow that he regarded the space so designated as a solid body, in which the sun, moon and stars were immoveably fixed: he speaks of things as they appear to be, not as they actually are. For this reason I have not thought it necessary to alter the ordinary version.

The word *רָקִיעַ* occurs, exclusively of its use in this chapter, v. 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 17, 20, eight times in the Old Testament, namely, Ps. xix. 2, cl. 1; Ezek. i. 22, 23, 25, 26, x. 1; and Dan. xii. 3. It denotes the expanse of the sky as visible to an inhabitant of earth, the space in which the heavenly bodies appear to be. It is an inquiry of no little interest, in what sense the word is used when it first occurs in this chapter. Does it here denote the whole space visible from earth, comprising that in which are the fixed stars as well as the luminaries of our own system? And does the writer intend to teach, that God set this expanse or seemingly solid substance, in which the sun, moon and stars were afterwards immoveably fixed, between two vast bodies of water, the one constituting the seas, &c., that belong to earth, and the other forming, as Gesenius says, “a celestial ocean?” And is it in this same sense that we read in Job xxxvii. 18, “hast thou spread out, *רָקִיעַ*, the sky *which is* strong, and *as* a molten looking glass?” and that the Psalm-

ist, cxlviii. 4, calls upon “the waters that are above the heavens” to hymn the praises of God? and that God is said (Ps. civ. 3,) to “lay the beams of his chambers in the waters?”

I do not deny that the language of the sacred writer, if explained independently of any other considerations than such as are merely verbal, would admit this meaning. But is this a necessary construction? It involves a view which is inconsistent with the system of philosophy, the truth of which is generally and on good grounds admitted. If this interpretation be maintained, we must then adopt a modified view of the author's inspiration, limiting it to the fact of creation and its general outlines, but allowing an intermixture of error in some of the details; or else, in defiance of ascertained facts, we must reject the Copernican system of astronomy. But the interpreter is not driven to the necessity of adopting either of these extremes. If the word רָקִיעַ is sometimes employed in its comprehensive sense to denote the whole visible expanse, including the region of the stars, or at least that in which they are said to be because they appear therein, and at other times for that portion of the atmosphere in which vapors float and clouds are formed, the interpretation need not militate against the received theory of the universe. Then the word in v. 14, 15, and 17, will express the former meaning, and in 6, 7, and 8, the latter. The “waters above the firmament” in that case will not be “a celestial ocean,” but that portion of the fluids of the watery mass which had risen in the atmosphere, and was then held in solution, or floated in the form of mists and clouds. They may be said to be *above* the firmament, although at no very great elevation from the earth, because above that part of it in which birds usually fly. PFEIFFER, in his *Dubia vexata Scripturæ Sacræ*, 4to., 1685, p. 7, attempts to make this interpretation ridiculous by remarking,

that one might as well say of a man immersed in the midst of the sea, that he was above the sea, or of a buried person, that he was above the earth, because in each case the party was above a part of the element. But it ought to be considered, that the language here is popular, rather than philosophical and accurate; and a part of the firmament or expanse, רָקִיעַ, might the rather be put for the whole and the whole for a part, according to circumstances, because the whole representation is made as things would appear to be to an observer supposed to be below, and not as they were in strictness of speech and abstractedly considered. To what extent the writer supposed the waters to exist in the atmosphere, is of little importance. The rising of mists, which were afterwards to descend as rain to water the ground, is expressly mentioned by him in ii. 6.

(8.) "For signs and for seasons." This is doubtless a hendiadys, meaning 'for signs of seasons,' in other words, to designate seasons. That anything "preternatural" is intended, is entirely unfounded, either in the necessary meaning of the word, or in the facts alleged to illustrate such a sense, which in the present age are universally allowed to be ordinary phenomena, arising from natural causes. It was therefore with no little surprise that I read in Professor Bush's note on this place the following statement. "The heavenly bodies serve for signs, whenever the judgments of God or extraordinary events are *signified* by remarkable appearances in them. In this way eclipses of the sun and moon, comets, meteors, falling stars, &c. serve as *signs*, i. e. as preternatural tokens or monitions of the divine agency in the sight of men. This is the genuine force of the original, which very often conveys the idea of a *miraculous* interference." Equally genuine is the application of the original word to ordinary occurrences, as the author by the qualifi-

cation implied in the phrase "very often" plainly intimates. His extraordinary inference, towards the end of the same note, founded on the omission of the word "for," is equally incapable of support. He considers it as evidence, that "the sense of the phrase is undoubtedly 'for days, *even* years'; implying that a *day* is often to be taken for a *year* (!), as is the case in prophetic computation."

Among the objections to which the Mosaic history of the creation has been thought to lie exposed, one by no means trifling is drawn from the account of the formation of the heavenly bodies on the fourth day, while the creation of light is ascribed to the first. It has often been replied, that previously to the creation of the sun, the light divided between the day and night, by being diffused and withdrawn according to the will and power of God, who on the fourth day concentrated the light in the body of the sun; and that the former method of regulating this vicissitude would have been no more difficult for the Omnipotent than that which has ever since prevailed. The last remark is unquestionably true, although the proposed solution does not satisfy an inquirer. He may rejoin, that God does nothing in vain, and that the recurrence of evening and morning mentioned in connexion with the first three days being exactly the same as the following, it would seem to have arisen from the same cause. And this view may be defended on either of two suppositions: first, that the Mosaic creation is that of the earth simply, and that the heavenly bodies are said to have been formed on the fourth day, because on that day they showed themselves through the purified atmosphere in all their glory, as adapted to shed light over the earth and to designate divisions of time;* or secondly, that the crea-

* The coincidence of this view and that of Professor Bush in his note on v. 14 will be the more striking, when it is recollected that neither writer had any knowledge of the sentiments of the other. For the read-

tion of the heavenly bodies may have been contemporaneous with that of the earth. The formation of the sun may have been commenced on the first day, and the light then called into existence for the benefit of earth's chaos may have flowed from his orb, its rays being originally feeble, but gradually increasing in strength and intensity, as his own creation and that of our globe were both advancing towards perfection. There is nothing in the third verse which requires the admission, that light burst at once in all its splendor upon the unformed material, neither is such a supposition consistent with analogy. Gradual formations characterize the works of nature, and the Mosaic narrative affords no evidence that the original creation was effected by instantaneously producing the perfectly constructed creature.

It cannot be denied that such a view is more in harmony with the account of the creation effected during the other five days, than that which assumes the sun, moon and stars to have been altogether created on the fourth. On this supposition, the want of analogy in the aggregate created on

er's satisfaction I quote the following: "If this history of the creation were designed to describe the effects of the six days' work *as they would have appeared to a spectator, had one been present*—a supposition rendered probable from its being said, 'Let the dry land appear,' (Heb. be seen,) 'when as yet there was no eye to see it'—then we may reasonably conclude that the sun was formed on the first day, or perhaps had been created even *before* our earth, and was in fact the cause of the vicissitude of the three first days and nights. But as the globe of the earth was during that time surrounded by a dense mass of mingled air and water, the rays of the sun would be intercepted; only a dim glimmering light, even in the day time, would appear, and the bodies of the heavenly luminaries would be entirely hidden, just as they now are in a very cloudy day. Let it be supposed, then, that on the fourth day the clouds, mists, and vapors were all cleared away, and the atmosphere made pure and serene, the sun of course would shine forth in all his splendor, and to the eye of our imagined spectator would seem to have been just created; and so at night of the moon and stars." p. 35.

each day must strike the most inattentive reader; and the difficulty thus raised in his mind will not be removed by the common-place remark, that God could as easily create in one day the unnumbered worlds of the celestial bodies as the slightest productions of the ground. The question is not, what the Almighty can readily do, but what view of this part of the narrative best corresponds with the representation made in the other parts.

It may be objected to this view, that in reality it assigns no specific creation to the fourth day, which merely exhibits in clear distinctness the substances previously existing, while the same terms are used, expressive of creation, which were before employed. But let it be considered, that the principle of life and action which was at first infused into the mass would still be exerting its energies. The perfection of creation would be ever advancing on the fourth day as on the former days, until the celestial worlds broke into view from behind the vanishing veil of cloud and mistiness.* Appearing for the first time, and of course as new creations, they would be described as such in the same phraseology as had been before used. Besides, the principal point in the author's mind is the purposes which they were intended to serve for the benefit of man. It is not so much their creation on that day, as the uses to which they were to be put, on which he insists. The next chapter affords a similar specimen of composition, and it may be adduced to illustrate the language under consideration. The point to which the histo-

* I have for some years entertained the opinion that this is the true view of the text. The conclusion arrived at is the result of reflection on the history itself and the universally acknowledged facts of natural philosophy. The reader will perceive that I hold it in common with many others. And it may be worthy of notice that the same view was entertained by some of the most learned fathers of the Church. See the works referred to in Dr. WISEMAN's Lectures on the connexion between science and revealed religion. p. 178.

rian principally directs his reader's attention in ii. 18—25, is the production of the woman as a suitable partner for the man. The 18th verse states the divine intention to provide him with such a partner. This is immediately followed in the 19th by the words, "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air." Does the sacred writer intend to teach us that the formation of every beast and fowl was subsequent to the divine determination just expressed, and of course subsequent to the creation of man himself? This would be to contradict the account of the creation as given in the previous chapter. He intends to introduce the narrative of the manner in which God's purpose to provide man with a suitable companion was accomplished. As it was proper for this end that Adam should inspect the various animals, their creation is mentioned in immediate connexion with their being brought to him, although it had taken place before the man himself had been called into existence. The same principle may be applied to the account of the fourth day's work. It is not necessary to understand the sacred writer as asserting the creation of the heavenly bodies on that day, but only their developement on that day as adapted to the purposes intended, the creation of them having previously taken place.

It is probable that some of my readers will consider the second of the above named suppositions as more in accordance with the comprehensive language of the first verse and the general representations of Scripture. If the formation of some of the celestial bodies began at the same time with that of the earth, and if on the fourth day they were completed, or sufficiently so for the purposes intended, a popular use of language would allow expressions denoting creation to be applied to the perfection of their structure and organization. Whether this view would not involve the

interpreter in other difficulties arising out of the physical constitution of the universe, requires his serious consideration.

If the view maintained in this note be admitted to be true, it follows, that the opinion which presumes the author to have regarded the planetary worlds as fixtures in the solid arch of heaven and appendages to this globe, has not the least foundation in this part of the sacred narrative.

(9.) The use of the plural in this passage has been variously accounted for. ROSENMUELLER considers it as nothing more than the usage of the Hebrew, in common with other languages, to employ the plural occasionally for the singular. He refers to Job xviii. 2, 3, “How long ere *ye* make an end of words? *Mark ye* &c. רַבְרְבִי.” Wherefore are we—reputed vile *in your sight*, רַבְרְבִי; 2 Sam. xvi. 20, “Then said Absalom to Ahithophel, *give* counsel *among you*, לָבִי לָבִי”; and xxiv. 14, “And David said unto Gad, I am in a great strait: let *us* fall, רַבְרְבִי.” But all these places are explicable on other grounds. Bildad addresses Job in the plural, because he connects him with all who held the same sentiments; as, in Isa. viii. 11, 12, 13, God addresses the faithful in the person of his prophet. “The Lord spake to *me*—and instructed *me*,—saying, say *ye* not—neither fear *ye*, &c.; let the Lord of hosts be *your* fear and—*your* dread.” Absalom seeks counsel of Ahithophel’s coadjutors as well as of himself; and David, in regarding the divine indignation as directed against his own person, has reference also to the exposure of his people. Some other passages which have been referred to are also not altogether satisfactory in favor of such usage, as the speaker may mentally connect others with himself. See Gen. xxix. 27, Num. xxii. 6, Dan. ii. 36, and 1 Kings iii. 26, in the Hebrew.

Besides, although an interchangeable use of singular and plural may occasionally take place, as in Cant. i. 4, “Draw *me*, *we* will run after thee; the king hath brought *me* into his chambers, *we* will be glad and rejoice in thee,” and in several other places; yet it does not apply in the present case, as the whole clause which expresses the divine determination is in the plural.

Some suppose the plural to be used here in accommodation to the language of human dignitaries. Thus Aben Ezra on v. 1, speaking of the form אֱלֹהִים אַחֵר. אֱלֹהִים שֶׁמִּצִּיאָנוּ אֱלֹהִהּ יָדַעְנוּ כִּי אֱלֹהִים לְשׁוֹן רַבִּים וְשֶׁרֶשׁ זֶה מִדְּרַךְ הַלְשׁוֹן כִּי כָל לְשׁוֹן יֵשׁ לוֹ דְּרַךְ כְּבוֹד וּכְבוֹד לְשׁוֹן לוֹעַז שִׁיאָמַר הִקְטֵן לְנֹכַח הַגְּדוֹל לְשׁוֹן רַבִּים וּבִלְשׁוֹן יִשְׁמַעְאֵל דְּרַךְ כְּבוֹד שִׁידְבַּר הַגְּדוֹל כְּמוֹ הַמֶּלֶךְ בִּלְשׁוֹן רַבִּים וּבִלְשׁוֹן הַקֹּדֶשׁ דְּרַךְ כְּבוֹד לוֹמַר עַל הַגְּדוֹל לְשׁוֹן רַבִּים וְגו’

“As we afterwards meet with אֱלֹהִהּ, we know that אֱלֹהִים is the plural form from that root. Such is the usage of the language; for every language has a mode of expressing honorable distinction. In some foreign tongues this is done by the inferior addressing his superior in the plural, and, in Arabic, kings and great men employ the same number. This is also the case in Hebrew.” The same principle has been applied also to other texts; as, for example, to 2 Sam. vii. 22, “according to all that *we* have heard with *our* ears.” But in a prayer to God remarkable for its profound humility, it is not to be supposed that David would employ the plural as indicative of majesty, and such an use never elsewhere appears in the whole prayer, which is of considerable length. Undoubtedly, in this clause, he connects himself with the nation, as the next verse plainly proves: “And what one nation in the earth is like thy people, &c.” Neither are the instances which have been adduced in order to show that the same use of the plural is found in Chaldee, satisfactory. Daniel, ii. 23, in his thanksgiving to

God, cannot be supposed to use language indicating his own dignity. He associates with himself his friends, whose intercessions with God he had before desired, (v. 17, 18,) when he says: "thou hast made known unto *us* the king's matter." And so also in v. 33, "*we* will tell the interpretation," the plural may be used for the same reason; or Daniel may appear as the representative of the wise men. The whole tenor of his address shows that he had no intention of assuming dignity in the presence of the Babylonian monarch. Another text, Ezra. iv. 18, may perhaps bear upon the principle, but even this is not sufficiently explicit to prove it; and if it were, it is of too late a date to illustrate the language of Genesis, and being Chaldaic, could not settle Hebrew usage. King Artaxerxes does employ the plural of himself: "the letter which ye sent unto *us*." But most probably he associates with himself his royal council. The language immediately following is in the singular: "hath been plainly read before *me*, and *I* commanded, &c." Another instance of similar usage may be found in Gen. xxxix. 14, although I am not aware that it has ever been cited in reference to the principle under consideration. Potiphar's wife cries out to her attendants, "see (עֲנִי the plural,) he hath brought in a Hebrew unto *us*, to mock *us*." But undoubtedly she comprehends her attendants, and speaks of the asserted insult as directed against all the family. Immediately afterwards, speaking solely of herself, she employs throughout the singular number. It is very questionable, therefore, whether this royal use of the plural implying authority or distinction, existed in very ancient periods; and modern usage can have no weight.

Others again regard the phraseology as founded on the scriptural doctrine of the plurality of persons in the divine essence, one being supposed to address another. This view agrees not only with the plain declarations of the New

Testament in which this doctrine is avowed, but also with occasional intimations of it given in the Old, and is in character with the relative importance of the act of creation which immediately follows. Under these circumstances, I cannot venture to reject such an interpretation. It may indeed be, that the plural form is employed to denote the plenitude of powers existing in God, in addition to the plurality of persons. The Supreme may be distinguished as the being who manifests himself everywhere and under various forms in the powers of nature, and also in the authorities of heaven. The multiplicity of God's works, as well as the mysterious nature of his subsistence, may have had an influence on this form of language, by which his nature and character are expressed. See Drechsler's *Einheit und Aechtheit der Genesis*, p. 14, 15.

There is, however, another view of this subject, which appears to be well worthy of consideration. Rashi explains the use of the plural on the ground of divine condescension. The supreme being is considered as an elevated monarch, surrounded by his nobles, as the great father in the midst of his family. The solemnity and deliberation with which he enters on the creation of man are described by representing the deity as if he had condescended to consult with his most distinguished angels previously to the act. The image of royalty surrounded by its dignitaries, is sometimes employed to delineate the more vividly the character and proceedings of God. This figure illustrates the language of our Lord respecting little children: "their angels do always behold the face of my father who is in heaven," Matt. xviii. 10; that is, they are his most intimate attendants, his courtiers ever near his throne and favored with his presence. Comp. Esther i. 14, "The next unto him (the king,)—the seven princes of Persia and Media, which *saw the king's face* and which *sat the first in the kingdom*"; and Jer. lii. 25.

“Seven men of them that were near the king’s person;” literally, ‘who see the king’s face,’ רֹאֵי פְנֵי-הַמֶּלֶךְ. It is also the ground of the exhibition made by the prophet Micaiah to Ahab in 1 Kings, xxii. 19, “I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left.” And in Isaiah, chap. vi., we find the same representation. The prophet sees the Lord sitting on his throne and attended by the Seraphim. The language of the 8th verse is particularly worthy of notice in illustration of that under review: “I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us?” The holy Seraphs are so intimately connected with the great king, the Lord of hosts, that his mission is represented as theirs. The purposes, interests, and measures of both are identified, and the acts, which, properly speaking, are those of the head, are figuratively attributed to the members. Thus also the triumphs of Christ, and the judgment which he is to institute, have been supposed by some to be ascribed to his people, on the ground of that spiritual union by which both parties become so intimately associated as to be incapable of disunion.* The creation of man is of course the act of God alone, but the principle illustrated allows us to consider the language which expresses his intention as an appeal to his holy attendants.

* The language of Vitringa, in his dissertation, *De sceptro Judæ superstitæ, nato Christo*, in his *Observationes Sacræ*, Lib. iv. cap. vi. § vii. p. 956, is so well adapted to express my meaning, that I cannot forbear citing it. *Christi Jesu regnum aliquod est in mundo, cujus subditi sunt omnes electi credentes. Hi proin regnum Christi dicuntur. Sed iidem illi in sanctis literis dicuntur reges, et cum Christo rege suo regnare. Non alia quidem de causa, quam quod per fidem et amorem tam arcte cum Christo voluntatibus suis conjuncti sint, ut quod Christus agit dominus, ipsi agere; quæ Christo Jesu ex regni administratione nascitur gloria, ipsorum gloria; quam Christus exercet potestatem, eandem ipsi in et cum Christo exercere censeantur.*

They exult in the wisdom and power of the maker, "the sons of God shout for joy." Job, xxxviii. 7. They participate in the pure delight with which the creator contemplates his work, and feel the same complacency as if the act had been their own.

(10.) The image of God is a phrase expressive of excellence and authority. This is implied in ix. 6, where the creation of man in God's image is stated as a reason for the capital punishment of the murderer: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man." In the eighth Psalm, also, supremacy over the inferior creatures is represented as a part of that "glory and honor" with which man was originally "crowned." This is evident, moreover, from the history before us, where authority over the inferior animals is immediately connected with the image of God, by which man was distinguished. Knowledge and wisdom must necessarily be implied; not, indeed, of that exalted and comprehensive kind which has often been claimed for our first parent, but a degree correspondent with that perfection in which all the works of God were made. It seems inconsistent to suppose, with HENGSTENBERG (*Christologie des Alten Testaments*, Vol. I. p. 34, in KEITH'S Translation, p. 32,) and others, that while Adam's body was created perfect, his intellect was in the condition of childhood. And on the other hand, it is equally objectionable to assume with MAIMONIDES, (יְסוּדֵי הַתּוֹרָה, grounds of the law, chap. iv. § 14, p. 45, edit. Vorst. Amstelod. 1638, 4to.) that the intellectual principle constituted the form in which man was created: הַדְמָה שֶׁהָיָה צוּרַת הַנֶּפֶשׁ. The most important features of the divine image in the first man were doubtless his moral purity and holiness. These qualities are referred to in Eccles. vii. 29, Eph. iv. 24, Col. iii. 10. In the two

latter texts they are spoken of as distinguishing “the new man which is created after God,” in contradistinction to the “old man,” the sinful character which predominates in the natural mind; and the apostle evidently refers to the image of God in which man was originally made.

Many divines, both ancient and modern, have maintained, that the gift of the Holy Spirit constituted the most important feature of the divine image in which Adam was created. See Bishop BULL’s Discourse on the state of man before the fall. I have not thought proper to advance this opinion, as I am not satisfied that it can be supported by sufficient scriptural proof. Certainly Gen. ii. 7, so often alleged in defence of it, is altogether inadequate. It expresses the divine origin of the living principle and soul of our first parent.

To represent the image of God as consisting in uprightness of external person, in contradistinction to the general form of other animals, presumes an ignorance of the divine being inconsistent with the character of the writer, and gives a contemptible sense, alike unworthy of the book and incapable of proof. Such childish conceptions of God are very little in harmony with the majesty, wisdom, and power, ascribed to him in the representations throughout the chapter. Indeed, it may well be doubted, whether the erect form in which man was created, was even intended to indicate that divine image in which his soul was originally made, although such an opinion has been often expressed and is avowed by Augustin. *Si ergo et hominem de terra et bestias de terra ipse formavit, quid habet homo excellentius in hac re, nisi quod ipse ad imaginem Dei creatus est? Nec tamen hoc secundum corpus, sed secundum intellectum mentis, de quo post loquimur. Quanquam et in ipso corpore habeat quandam proprietatem, quæ hoc indicet, quod erecta statura factus est, ut hoc ipso admoneretur, non sibi terrena esse sectanda, velut pecora, quorum voluptas omnis ex terra est, unde in*

alvum cuncta prona atque prostrata sunt. Congruit ergo, &c. De Genesi ad literam, Lib. VI. cap. xii. Opera, Tom. III. p. 155, edit. Bened. The ground of distinction which is supposed to be found in the form of the inferior creatures, is insufficient as an argument, inasmuch as it is not true of all, especially of birds.

I consider the language of Dr. PALFREY, in his *Academical Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities*, p. 224, 225, (Lect. X.), as utterly unfounded and dishonorable to the intellectual and religious character of the great Hebrew lawgiver. "The mind of Moses had not yet" (the period referred to in Ex. xxxiii.) been elevated to the conception of a purely spiritual deity. How should it be? How can we represent to ourselves the probability of such an immense progress having been made by him beyond the universal apprehensions of his age? Moses could have had no idea but of a deity with a body; a body glorious indeed, but definite, limited, and visible." Indeed! Did Moses receive any knowledge of God from revelation, or was he left to the guidance of his natural powers? It is only on the latter supposition that the author's inquiry has any force; and it is hardly necessary to add, that this supposition implies a denial of his inspiration and divine authority. "The doctrine alone of Moses, so *remote from the sentiments and philosophy of his age, and so agreeable to truth*, creates a strong presumption of his having received it by *immediate revelation*." *Dissertation on Miracles* by HUGH FARMER, chap. iii. sect. iii. p. 148, third edition, London, 1810, 12mo.

(11.) An attempt has been made to explain these verses so as to comprehend the grant of animal food to man, as well as vegetable. But the interpretation is evidently forced. The express grant of animal food was given after the flood,

ix. 3: "every living thing that moveth shall be meat for you;" but probably such food had been used before, as it is fitted to the human constitution, and otherwise a disproportionate increase of cattle must have taken place. Indeed, it is likely from ix. 4, that some of the antediluvians practised cruel abuses, and ate the living flesh.

(12.) In the second verse, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Septuagint and Syriac versions, read sixth day instead of seventh. But this is probably a departure from the original text, intended to remove the supposed difficulty of God's being said to have finished on the seventh day. The apparent contradiction between this and what is said in the last of the first chapter, is removed by considering the verb here as in the pluperfect.

The paradisaical origin of the sabbath as a day of holy rest and worship, is clearly to be inferred from the text. The supposition of anticipative reference to the fourth commandment is an unnatural assumption. As the Sabbath is an institution alike useful and important for mankind in general, it were unreasonable to limit its benefits to one nation without explicit authority. The intimations, which occasionally appear in the book of Genesis, of more than ordinary solemnity being attached to the number seven, and particularly its use in designating periods of time, are best explained on this ground. The sabbath is not indeed directly mentioned in the history of the patriarchs, but it is probably alluded to; and if not, the remarkable brevity of the narrative diminishes the force of any argument which might be drawn from the omission. The manner in which the Hebrew law commences, "*remember* the sabbath day," (Exod. xx. 8,) seems to imply that the institution was not altogether new, although it had fallen greatly into desuetude; and this view of the subject affords the best exposition of

the narrative, (chap. xvi.) in which the sabbath is originally introduced. It is true, that sometimes the law is urged on the ground of a different sanction from that first presented, as in Deut. v. 15, when the deliverance of the Hebrews from the slavery of Egypt is stated as the motive: "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm; *therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath-day." But this is not exclusive of the original sanction. It adds to it by an appeal to the gratitude of the Hebrews. Thus also we celebrate the Christian sabbath or Lord's day, in commemoration of our Saviour's resurrection, as well as of the creation of all things.

Since writing the above, I have met with Professor J. G. PALFREY's Academical Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities: Boston, 1838. In the ninth lecture of this work, he states his view of the nature and origin of the sabbath, which he considers as an institution purely Mosaic, requiring simply cessation from labor, not at all of a religious character, and in this respect "entirely different" from "the Christian Lord's-day." Although it would not comport with the design of these notes to discuss this whole subject copiously, yet I cannot but remark on some points in the Professor's statements and course of argument, which appear to me wholly unwarranted.

Dr. Palfrey allows the deliverance from Egypt and the designation of a covenant between God and the Hebrew people, to be the distinguishing characteristics of the Jewish sabbath. p. 188, 194. And yet he does not hesitate to say as follows: "A Jew who should sit perfectly unemployed, or even who should sleep, through the day, would have kept the sabbath with a punctilious observance." p. 186. And again: "Rest from labor, (which may be mere indolent re-

pose,) I find to be the essence of the Jewish observance." p. 197. Is it reasonable to believe that an institution so unmeaning in the character of its requisition, which the brute creation could be made to observe as punctually and fully as man, should have been established by the allwise, and enjoined on the Hebrews, by solemn sanctions, as commemorative of a great national deliverance, and as a perpetual sign of covenant relationship with God? I should be at a loss to vindicate the wisdom or propriety of an institution having such important objects in view, "the essence of the observance" of which "may be *mere indolent repose*."

The author objects to the application in favor of the sabbath being used as a day of "religious services," which has often been made of the question put to the Shunammite by her husband: "Wherefore wilt thou go to him (the prophet) to-day? it is neither new moon nor sabbath." 2 Kings iv. 23. "Nothing is said or implied of worship. The sabbaths and the new moons were both holidays, and therefore suitable for the offering of presents and the visiting of friends; and accordingly, the question is asked, why a day should be chosen for visiting Elisha which was not the customary day." p. 186, note. It will not be contended that any explicit and definite recognition of divine worship on the sabbath is contained in the text quoted; and neither is there any such recognition of what the author supposes to be the ostensible object of the visit. But when we read in Isa. lxvi. 23, "it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to *worship* before me, saith the Lord," can it be denied that sabbaths and new moons were at that time regarded as well known and established seasons of worship? And is it not most reasonable to infer that the connexion of the two feasts in the former passage, exactly analogous to that in the latter, implies that they were both so used in the time of the

Shunammitess? And this, be it remembered, was only about a century and a half before Isaiah wrote.* We have therefore, in the places before us, ordinary practice founded on the law, and exhibiting the national construction then given to the law. And wherein could this construction have been found but in the natural meaning of the language of the law, the "sanctification" of the sabbath which it announces, and the "holy convocation" which it requires? See Levit. xxiii. 3. On this latter point the Professor remarks, that the "holy convocation appears to mean no more than that there should be an assemblage of such as might be within convenient distance, to witness the one national sacrifice, offered at the one place of national worship; or perhaps that there should be festive meetings of friends, a use to which we know that the day was actually put. See Luke xiv. 1; Hos. ii. 11." But the command respecting the sacrifice of which he speaks, does not occur in the chapter of Leviticus. It is to be found in Num. xxviii. 9, 10, to which the phrase in Leviticus cannot possibly refer; nor is it credible that it should refer to the same thing, the sacrifice itself, which would then undoubtedly have been specified in the context. But so far from this being the case, it is evidently implied that the holy convocation is an essential constituent of the sabbatical requisitions, as also of the other festivals mentioned in the chapter. With the text in Leviticus above referred to, compare v. 2, 4, 7, 8, 21, 24, 27, 35, 36, 37. To limit such convocation to an assemblage at the national altar, is therefore inadmissible; because, while some of the festivals were celebrated only in that place, others were kept wherever it might be convenient to the party.

* The genuineness of the latter part of the book of Isaiah, which by universal consent has, until late years, been ascribed to the prophet, is here presumed; and I think has been satisfactorily maintained against all the objections which German neologians have raised against it.

The references by which the author endeavors to prove the second alternative suggested by him, after Le Clerc and others, that the ‘holy convocation’ was a “festive meeting of friends,” can at the very most only show that such meetings did occasionally take place on the sabbath, but surely not that they constituted an essential part of the requisition of the law. If this were the case, it were difficult to see how the unemployed or sleeping Jew could have punctiliously observed the sabbath. But the applicability of the references is itself doubtful. The first only shows, with various other places in the Gospels, that our Lord occasionally accepted an invitation to a meal on the sabbath. That any ‘festivity’ was connected with those occasions cannot be proved. In the only other passage referred to, the prophet classes sabbaths with all other solemn feasts, and declares that the “mirth” with which their celebration was characterized should “cease.” Doubtless the Jewish festivals were intended to be occasions of devout and grateful joy, marked at the same time by a generous, though rational allowance of the gratifications of life. What we know of human nature will not suffer us to doubt, that they were perverted to extravagant and luxurious indulgence, in proportion as the people became vicious and threw off the restraints of religion. And this is probably part of the mirth to which Hosea alludes, although it cannot be doubted that he predicts the loss of all the ‘gladness’ which their joyful celebrations brought along with them. But that the sabbath could not have been intended to be kept with much festivity or luxurious gratification of the appetite, would seem quite evident from the law which forbade a fire to be kindled on that day. See *Exod.* xxxv. 3. The spirit of the language in *Isa.* lviii. 15, is also adverse to such a supposition. “If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord,

honorable, and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, &c."

In considering that view of the sabbath which supposes it to be of paradisaical origin, as given in the former part of this note, the Professor explains the meaning of the phrase, "God blessed and sanctified the seventh day," thus, "he pronounced a blessing upon it,—he commended it,—because (this is agreeable to the whole anthropomorphitic cast of the passage) it was for him a day of leisure after six days of toil. 'And he *sanctified* it.' How? By making it a holy institution? This is the gloss put upon the word by force of an opinion derived from some subsequent texts, but the word itself implies no such thing. It signifies merely 'to set apart,' 'to sequester,' to some distinctive use, just as we might speak of *dedicating* or *devoting* a day to amusement, to leisure, to study.* And I submit with confidence, that, if we were not biassed to a peculiar interpretation of this text by views preconceived from other sources, we should not think of regarding it as speaking of the appointment, at any time, or in any way, of a religious institution for man. We should understand it but as declaring, either that God (for himself, and not for man,) *made* the last day of the first week (for the time being, and not for future time,) happy and sacred, peculiar, distinct from the days which had preceded, by resting upon it; or that he *called* that day a blessed and a holy, distinguished day, on which he thus found repose from labor." p. 189, 190.

According to the author, then, the meaning of the words, "God blessed the seventh day," is simply this, 'God commended the seventh day of the first week.' This is very in-

* We should perhaps hardly speak of *consecrating* a day to any but a religious use. But the French freely use their corresponding word with all the latitude which we give to 'dedicate,' and 'devote.'

telligible. A day may be commended, praised, pronounced blessed, because it is in use or has been used as a period of rest. But what meaning does he attach to the phrase, "*sanctified it?*" In reality, none at all beyond what is implied in the term "blessed." "He made it happy and sacred, or he called it blessed and holy, by resting upon it;" that is, the resting of God is itself the consecration. He does indeed say that the word signifies, "to set apart, devote." But such "sequestration, distinctive use," implies some object, which, according to the author's view, can be none other than the "rest" which "God himself enjoyed." How, then, does such a sense of the phrase accord with what follows? 'God pronounced a blessing upon the seventh day, and set it apart for his own rest, because that in it he rested from all his work.' Thus the fact stated is made to appear as a reason for itself!

The text declares in language sufficiently perspicuous, not that God's resting on that individual day is *identical* with the blessing and setting apart of it, but that he blessed and set it apart *because* he had rested on it; and this setting of it apart for the specified reason must have been for some object other than the reason itself.

What this object was, is quite clear from other texts, which have plainly a retrospective reference to this in Genesis: "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, &c., and rested the seventh day, *wherefore* the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it," (that is, sanctified it; for both the verbs are the same as those used in Genesis.) Ex. xx. 11. "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, &c.; it is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever; *for* in six days the Lord made heaven and earth." Ex. xxxi. 16, 17.

Dr. Palfrey would remove the difficulty which these passages and the one under consideration present to his view,

in a very summary way. The old theory of anticipation, he very properly does not seem to regard as worthy of notice. But the knot that cannot be untied, must be cut. He maintains that both these texts are spurious, and advances his interpretation of the one in Genesis, "supposing the latter half of the second verse and the third to be genuine," plainly enough intimating his suspicion that they are not. As his course of argument tends, in my opinion, to unsettle our confidence in the genuineness of such passages in the Pentateuch as may seem to us inconsistent with others, or may be irreconcilable with our own views, I must beg the reader's indulgence while I endeavor briefly to examine it. In order to enable him to judge for himself, and to give at the same time a full representation of the author's reasoning, I shall extract the whole argument.

"I would ask whether any one can compare this verse (Ex. xx. 11,) carefully with its parallel in Deuteronomy, and then be confident in the opinion that it did make an original part of the decalogue. In Deuteronomy (v. 15,) we find no such words, but instead of them the following, which accord entirely with the view of the institution first given above: 'And remember that thou wert a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence with a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm; *therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath-day.'

"Will it be said, that one of these texts cannot be used to invalidate the other, inasmuch as the reason given in Exodus, and that in Deuteronomy, were both good, and not mutually inconsistent, reasons for the institution; that they were both accordingly announced on Sinai; and that in Exodus the mention of only one was preferred, in Deuteronomy only of the other? I apprehend that, under the circumstances, this view is altogether untenable. What the writer of the

Pentateuch is doing in both these instances, is not prescribing an institution, and assigning reasons for it. In that case he might, no doubt, with perfect propriety, select, from among good reasons, one to be urged at one time, and another at another time. But what he has undertaken to do, is to relate to us a fact; to tell us what God declared, by a supernatural voice, at a certain place and time; and those too, I may add, a place and time when every word was to be chosen, to make the most effectual impression. Under these circumstances, can it be maintained that Moses, designing to act the part of a veracious narrator, in acquainting us with specific *words which God spake*,* could give important words in one place, then omit them in another, where he is relating the same occurrence, and give us other important words, significant of a quite different cause of a material provision of his law, in their stead?

“I have said, that Moses undertakes, in these two texts, if he wrote both, to apprise us of *words which God spake** in the people’s hearing; and yet they differ from each other. But we are told still more respecting the specific character of the words in question. God ‘wrote them,’ it is said, (that is, wrote the words recited in the context,) ‘in two tables of stone.’ Deut. v. 22. If he wrote the precise words recorded in Deuteronomy as the decalogue—those words, and no other, (and under the circumstances it seems unavoidable to interpret with all this precision,)—then the decalogue did not contain the words attached in Exodus to the fourth commandment, in which that precept is said to be founded on the event of God’s creation of the world. And, as if to preclude all doubt upon the point, it is even declared, in the passage last quoted, that no other words were used than the words which it specifies. ‘These words the Lord spake—

* The use of the italics is the author’s.

and he added no more ; and he wrote them in two tables of stone.'

"If, then, under the circumstances, the essential character of an exact narrative precludes the supposition of both these passages having been written by Moses, which is to be regarded as having proceeded from his hand? Certainly no reasons appear why the authenticity of that in Exodus should be asserted to the prejudice of the other ; and if the question had to be left altogether in suspense, I apprehend that the remarks which have been made would show it to be altogether unsafe to argue, from the passage in Exodus, that the sabbatical institution was contemporaneous with the creation of the world. But further ; in comparing the claims of the two passages to be considered authentic, one to the exclusion of the other, we cannot lose sight of the fact, that the passage in Deuteronomy presents the same view of the sabbath with that exhibited so fully in the texts quoted above : a circumstance which affords strong presumption of its superior authority.

"These views, I think, dispose one strongly to the conclusion, that the verse of Exodus in question was not written by Moses, but by some later hand. Nothing could be more natural than for some possessor of his writings, struck by an apparent coincidence between the command to keep the Jewish sabbath, as inserted in the decalogue, and God's reposing on the seventh day, as related at the beginning of Genesis, to have recorded his remark as a gloss in the margin of his book, whence, as is known to have been the case with some of the most important interpolations of the Bible, it subsequently found its way into the body of the page. And I will not disguise my opinion, that the history of the text in Deuteronomy was probably the same, though it presents what I believe to be the true view of the sabbath. I have argued that both texts could not be genuine. I think

it most likely that neither is so; and my chief reason for this persuasion is, that, supposing the genuineness of either, it presents a fragment differing in its tone and structure from all the rest of the decalogue, since the decalogue, in every other case, studying the utmost brevity, deals only in laws and their sanctions, without exhibiting the reasons on which they were founded: a topic which seems foreign to its purpose.

“And the same view, I think, is to be taken, perhaps with even greater confidence, of the only other important text bearing upon this point, Ex. xxxi. 17. I will not say that this text is rendered suspicious by the abrupt change of persons which it exhibits, indicating the second clause to be but a gloss, though certainly its structure is strikingly consistent with that view. But, if I mistake not, the second clause, which is all that concerns us in this inquiry, is a palpable contradiction to the first, such as strongly to discredit the supposition that Moses was its writer. ‘The children of Israel,’ it is said, ‘shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant; it is a *sign between me and the children of Israel* forever.’ And why were the *children of Israel* to observe this *sign*, which was a token of *their covenant with God*? ‘For,’ the text goes on; ‘in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed,’ (*took breath*.) That is, for a sign between me and themselves, they are to keep a day, in which all the world, as much as themselves, has an interest. I can scarcely entertain a doubt that the last clause of the verse in question was, in the first instance, a note upon the passage to which we now find it attached, suggested by the reading of the related passage in the second chapter of Genesis.

“I have thus submitted what seems to me good reason for believing that neither of the two texts, quoted from the law

to prove the ante-Mosaic origin of the sabbatical institution, originally made part of that document, and for adhering accordingly to the conclusion, that the Jewish sabbath was simply a Jewish festival. The course which I take might be more questionable, were it not precisely the same, which reasons of the case,—scarcely, I think, more urgent than those which have application here,—compel us to take with respect to several texts, for which the mere external evidence is as complete as it is for any part of the Pentateuch, but which, notwithstanding, no one can deny to be spurious, provided he is of opinion that Moses wrote the book which contains them. There is no other alternative. We must either refer the whole Pentateuch to a later age, or we must allow that, after Moses had composed that volume, it shared, in some degree, the lot of other books, and received occasional interpolations, originating often in marginal comments. Believing that we have sufficient proof of Moses having written the books, we accordingly adopt that theory, along with its necessary incident of the spuriousness of certain parts; and this we do the more readily, because often a little observation shows us that these parts are of a parenthetical character, not breaking by their removal the continuity of the sense, and so presenting precisely the appearance which glosses of foreign origin would naturally wear.” pp. 190–195.

Preparatory to a review of the Professor’s arguments, I would also ask, whether any one can compare those three texts, and not perceive and feel that they exactly harmonize with each other, and also with the opinion of a paradisaical origin of the sabbath as a day of holy rest and worship. If spurious, then, the probability is exceedingly strong, that they were introduced with the view of supporting this opinion; which, consequently, must have been pretty generally admitted in the time of their author. This, of course, will carry up the opinion itself to a very early period; if it

be allowed that the Samaritan Pentateuch descended from copies existing among the ten tribes before the Assyrian captivity, or even the Babylonian, to a period when the Hebrew nation flourished in its greatness. And we may reasonably ask, whence such an opinion originated, if it be unfounded in scripture, as it must be if these texts are spurious. To the great deliverance from Egypt, the glorious independence of the people, the only fact which the sabbath was instituted to commemorate,—why should the Hebrews append a reference to the period of time employed by God in the formation of the world, and to the day of rest immediately subsequent, thus calling off the national mind from the single purpose intended, to another altogether different? All embarrassment on this point is removed by admitting the commonly received opinion.

I am willing to allow that the text of the New Testament is supported on external grounds, much more susceptible of careful observation and determinate settlement than that of the Old. This will probably be granted by all who are acquainted with the data on which each is maintained to be generally correct. In the language of the author, an interpolation may exist in the Pentateuch “for which the external evidence is as complete as it is for any part of it. We must allow that it shared in some degree the lot of other books, and received occasional interpolations.” But then, in every such case, satisfactory reasons for supposing interpolation must be given; and here Dr. Palfrey has failed in the case under consideration.

The whole ground on which he maintains the spuriousness of the three texts, is their alleged inconsistency with Deut. v. 15, and the representations so often made of the sabbath as a day of rest.* Unless he has substantiated his allegation, their genuineness remains unaffected.

* On the same ground, GABLER, in his *Versuche über the Schöp-*

The view commonly taken of the two texts in Exodus and Deuteronomy, that each assigns a separate reason for observing the sabbath not exclusive of the other,* is considered by the author as "untenable. The writer is not assigning reasons for an institution, but acquainting us with specific *words which God spake*." He particularly insists upon this point. "Moses undertakes to apprize us of *words which God spake* in the people's hearing;" and he "wrote them, that is, the words recited—the precise words recorded—those words, and no other. These words the Lord spake—and he added no more."

But I appeal to any candid and liberal interpreter to say, whether such an assumption is not unreasonable and contrary to the general use of scriptural language. When we read, that 'the word of the Lord came to a prophet, saying;' or, 'the Lord said unto a prophet,' does any one suppose that the language following such an introduction are the identical words in which the communication was audibly conveyed to the prophet's ear? To refute such an extravagant notion in the present day would be to waste the time and patience of the reader. And I apprehend that few would be more willing than the Professor himself to dispense with argument on such a point. And yet, I cannot see any essential difference between this case and that of giving the decalogue. In the latter the circumstances of

fungsgeschichte, p. 63, rejects Ex. xx. 8 ss. and xxxi. 12—17, because in Deut. v. 12—16, Moses mentions another design of the sabbath. See JAHN'S Introduction, p. 215, (note b); or his Einleitung in die Göttlichen Bücher des Alten Bundes, Theil II. p. 136.

* Maimonides has stated these two reasons with remarkable distinctness and propriety. They may be found in his Moreh Nevochim, Part II. chap. 31, p. 46, Berlin edition, 283, Buxtorf's Translation. Patrick, in his note on Ex. xx. 11, has placed his remarks within the reach of the English reader.

solemnity, of terror, of sublimity, and consequently of impression, are undoubtedly greater. The publicity of the audible communication is also a peculiar and an important circumstance. Still, it remains to be proved, that the author of the Pentateuch intended to deliver the very words in which the ten commandments were embodied. If he have clothed them in terms best fitted to express the laws intended to be promulged, he might employ the language which he has used, in evident consistency with the ordinary phraseology of scripture, even if the words had been selected by himself. Certain language, certain words, are constantly said to be used, when the meaning evidently is, that the sentiments which they express are avowed or cherished. See, among a multitude of illustrations, Deut. xxxiii. 9, Isa. xxviii. 15. The terms ‘word’ and ‘thing’ are often equivalent, and used in our translation to denote the same Hebrew expression דְּבַר. We have an illustration of this in Ex. xxxv. 1, 4: “These are the *words* דְּבַרִּים;” and, “this is the *thing* דְּבַר.” The former of these texts, together with the two verses immediately following, is so strikingly applicable to the point in question, that I must be allowed to quote them in full. “These are the *words* which the Lord hath commanded, that ye should do them. Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day.” On the ground which Dr. Palfrey assumes, the prohibition of a fire on the sabbath must also have been audibly enunciated by God himself; or rather, this text also must be stricken out of the Pentateuch, because it contains matter additional to the very words supposed to have been uttered, of which it is “even declared, as if to preclude all doubt upon the point,” (says the author,) “*and he added no more.*”

If we maintain that the language in which the decalogue is contained in Deuteronomy is the very words in which it was uttered on Sinai, then most certainly the language in Exodus (chap. xx.) cannot be the very words, for they differ in several particulars from the former, as any one may see who will take the trouble to compare them. And were it really necessary "to interpret with all this precision," I submit whether we should not rather suppose the chapter in Exodus to contain the identical words, because it is the history of the giving of the law, of the very original publication of it, whereas that in Deuteronomy is only the re-statement of the fact made by Moses to the Israelites long after it occurred.

Here, in passing, I may be allowed to express my firm persuasion, that not a few able commentators have perplexed themselves with difficulties leading to forced constructions of texts in themselves sufficiently plain, on the supposition that verbal harmony was to be expected, where the sacred writers intended simply to express the same thought, or to make the same general representation. A comparison of 2 Sam. vii. with 1 Chron. xvii, xxviii. 3—7, will afford an illustration to any one who is tolerably well acquainted with commentaries.

Thus far I have considered the point in question in reference to the ordinary scriptural use of language. But I ought not to omit the fact particularly important in this case, that the very term rendered *words* is actually the one employed by the divine historian to express the *commandments* themselves. Thus, in Ex. xxxiv. 29, we have for "the ten commandments," עֲשֵׂרֶת הַדְּבָרִים; and so in Deut. iv. 13, and x. 4, in both which places these same "ten commandments" or 'words,' דְּבָרִים, are said to have been written on the "two tables of stone." And it is especially worthy of notice, that in the very verse on the latter clause

of which Dr. Palfrey lays such stress (Deut. v. 22, in the Heb. 19,) the very same term occurs in the very same sense. “These *words* (commandments, מִצְוֹתַי,) the Lord spake unto all your assembly, &c.” Of course, when Moses says: “and he added no more; and he wrote them in two tables of stone,” he means to teach us, that the ten previously recited commandments constitute the whole of the law which was in that manner preserved. Whether one series of terms is employed in exhibiting them or another, is therefore of little or no consequence.

But although Dr. Palfrey has argued against the text in Exodus from that in Deuteronomy, his persuasion is that neither is genuine, because “the decalogue in every other case, studying the utmost brevity, deals only in laws and their sanctions,” while this “exhibits the reasons on which the law was founded, a topic which seems foreign to its purpose.”

If, indeed, the external evidence were of such a kind as to throw suspicion on the genuineness of the text, the Professor's argument might be allowed a place; although, even in that case, I think the importance to be attached to it would be very inconsiderable. The circumstances of the Israelites may have been such as to afford sufficient cause for giving the reasons of this particular law. Their long residence in Egypt may have weakened both their regard for the sabbatical institution, and their knowledge of the grounds on which it was established; and it may have been highly expedient to impress these considerations on their minds. And the positive nature of the law, in contradistinction to the moral character of all the others, may have added another motive leading to the introduction of reasons in this particular case. Besides, the lawgiver is not so studious of brevity as he is represented to be. The second commandment goes very much into detail, in the representation both of the law and its sanction. Neither can we

argue from any peculiarity in the manner of representing a law. Several contain merely the words of the statute; others exhibit, in more or less length, the sanctions; to the fifth alone, a direct and positive promise is added; and in the fourth, a reason for the institution which it prescribes. The author's "persuasion" is therefore not warranted by the grounds alleged.

The latter clause of Ex. xxxi. 17, is considered as spurious, because it "is a palpable contradiction to the first." But this assertion rests on very inadequate proof. The argument alleged is, that the observance of an institution intended as a sign of covenant relation between God and the Israelites, could not be required on the ground stated, which would equally well apply to all mankind. It is a sufficient answer to this objection, that the sabbath was revived among the Israelites after its observance had been partly lost, and then it was made a sign. Thus also circumcision was enjoined on Abraham's whole family, and yet, when the covenant relation became limited to the Israelites, it became a sign between God and them. Any institution divinely established by Moses might have been constituted a sign between God and his people, even if it had been observed in earlier patriarchal times. Its prior establishment and more general use are quite consistent with its re-establishment with this distinctive object in view. That part of the verse of the spuriousness of which Dr. Palfrey "scarcely entertains a doubt," gives a general reason for the sabbatical institution; the other states its particular intent in reference to the Israelites. Surely nothing like palpable contradiction can be proved.

The Mosaic account of the creation has been supposed to be contradicted by geological investigations, demonstrating that long periods of time must have been required for the

lives of those successions of animal and vegetable substances, and for those mineral productions, the existence of which is proved by organic and fossil remains still in being; and also for other phenomena, which an examination of the structure of the earth exhibits. But, on the other hand, some of the best geologists maintain, that the present state of the science proves the facts which have been discovered to be in harmony with the scriptural account properly understood. Various views of this account have had their respective advocates. A clear and comprehensive exhibition of these views may be seen, in an article on "The Connexion between Geology and the Mosaic History of the Creation, by EDWARD HITCHCOCK, Professor of Chemistry and Natural History in Amherst College," published in the *Biblical Repository and Quarterly Observer* for October, 1835.* Of these various views, two may be regarded as most entitled to respect. The one supposes the first verse to relate the original creation of the material which formed the substance of the world, and the remainder to be a history of its arranged and orderly construction, at some subsequent period, leaving sufficient time between the two for the production of the various phenomena. The other connects the first verse with the following in order of time, and interprets the days of distinct periods, sufficiently long to admit of the geological facts being explained. If the phrase, "the evening and the morning," which occurs so often in this narrative, be interpreted literally, (and this is in accordance with the narrative in general, and indeed with the general contents of the whole book of Genesis,) the conclusion is irresistible, that it designates the period of one revolution of the earth on its axis; the time ordinarily understood by the phrase 'day and night,' $\nu\upsilon\chi\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$. It is

* This instructive paper did not come under my notice until some time after I had written the above analysis and notes.

the opinion of several scientific men, and of some commentators, that the term 'day' is "equivalent to a period of undefined extent," and that, thus, the sacred writer speaks of "six indefinite days or periods made up of an equally indefinite number of common or twenty-four-hour days." This view is defended by Professor Bush in his note on Gen. i. 5, and is given in his language. But it is incapable of support, if the narrative be literal. True it is that the term 'day,' in Hebrew as in other languages, is often used for a period of time of undefined or unknown extent, and so is also the term 'hour;' as in the phrases "the day that the Lord God made, &c." "the day that I brought you out of the land of Egypt," "the day of the Lord cometh, &c.," "the hour cometh, &c.;" and in common parlance we say, "such an one has had his day," 'his day is past.' But the succession of days here mentioned to the seventh as much precludes any such supposition in this case, and obliges us, if we adhere to a literal sense, to comprehend the whole in one week, as would the consecutive notice of hours, from one to twelve, oblige us to understand the aggregate as denoting one popular day. It is said that "the true import of the numeral יָחַד *one*, seems in several instances to be that of *certain, peculiar, special*, Lat. *quidam*." This adjunct sense to its ordinary numeral meaning may perhaps be occasionally admitted, but very seldom, and never unless clearly intimated by the context or nature of the subject. The use of the cardinal *one* for the ordinal *first* in v. 5, may be explained by supposing that the historian, after mentioning the formation of light, its separation from darkness, and the name by which each was denoted, proceeds to say, that God having advanced so far in the act of creation, "the evening and the morning were יוֹם אֶחָד *day one*." Reckoning afterwards from this one day inclusive, he uses the ordinals *second, third, &c.* Comp. Tit. iii. 10, μετὰ μίαν

και δευτέρῃαν, after one and the *second*. This method of explanation is not indeed necessary, as the cardinal *one* is several times used for the ordinal *first*, of which it may be sufficient to give an instance from Gen. viii. 5. “בְּאַחַד לַחֹדֶשׁ” on the first (lit. *one*) of the month.” The learned commentator referred to endeavors to maintain his position by quoting “Dan. viii. 13, [3]: there stood before me *a ram*, Heb. אֶחָד אֶרֶם, *a certain ram*, that is, a ram of a peculiar description, one having two horns of unequal height.” But it is too plain to require proof, that the peculiarity of this ram is not denoted by the term אֶחָד, which is very properly rendered *a*, by a usage not at all uncommon; its peculiar characteristic is afterwards expressly stated. The next passage cited is also by no means satisfactory. “Ezek. vii. 5: ‘an evil, *an only evil*, behold, is come.’ Heb. רָעָה אֶחָד *one evil*, that is, an evil of a unique and unwonted nature.” But the peculiarity of the evil is shown rather from the repetition of the word which expresses it, רָעָה, than from the use of אֶחָד. The literal translation of the Hebrew is, ‘an evil, evil, (רָעָה אֶחָד רָעָה) behold, is come.’ A similar repetition occurs in the next verse: “an *end is come*, the *end is come*,” (קֵץ בָּא בָּא הַקֵּץ), and this is dwelt upon at the end of the verse: “behold, it is *come*,” and in the seventh: “the morning *is come*—the time *is come*.” If the numeral be intended to intimate the extraordinary character of the evil, doubtless the repetition is much better adapted to make the intended impression. The next passage appealed to, is Cant. vi. 9. But it is by no means certain that the numeral is intended to represent the bride in any other light than that of her mother’s only daughter. The Hebrew literally rendered is as follows: ‘one is she, my dove, my perfect, one is she of her mother;’ then, as might naturally be supposed of an only daughter, ‘the choice, (the darling,) is she of her

that bare her.' It cannot be denied, however, that what is said in viii. 8, may be a valid objection to this view ; but the want of sufficient data to prove the "little" one there introduced to have been sister of the bride enlogized in vi. 9, renders the objection uncertain, to say the least. But the apparent opposition between the "one" all-worthy object of the bride-groom's regard, and the multiplicity of "queens, concubines, and virgins" mentioned in the preceding verse, is in favor of the Professor's opinion. In this passage, therefore, as in Job. xxiii. 13, **אֶחָד** may imply the excellence of the party spoken of, which the context *expressly* asserts. Four texts are afterwards referred to. The first is Gen. xxxvii. 20, where Joseph's brothers propose to "slay him and cast him into *some* pit ;" literally, *one of the pits*, **בְּאַחַד הַבְּרוֹת** ; the second is 1 Kings xix. 4, "under *a* (**אֶחָד**) juniper tree," the third is 1 Kings xx. 13, "there came *a* (**אֶחָד**) prophet unto Ahab ;" and the last, Dan. viii. 13, "I heard *one* saint speaking, and *another* saint said, &c." where in both cases the Hebrew is **אֶחָד**. Did the Professor imagine that the pit, the juniper tree, the prophet, and the two saints, were each "peculiar, especially distinguished from other" things "of the same classes?" It is evident that these passages prove nothing to the purpose, and the reader on examining them is utterly at a loss to perceive their bearing on the usage intended to be proved. But if the usage could be admitted and applied to Gen. i. 5, the author's inference that "the evening and the morning constituted a period of time of indefinite length," would be limited to what is called "the first day," unless the argument for such usage were rested on the application of the term 'day,' as no such usage is pleaded for the other numerals.

The length of time allotted to each one of the revolutions designated by the term 'day,' is not indeed determined. Still, it cannot be so far extended as to meet the demands

of geological science, while at the same time the authority of the inspired historian is supported, without involving consequences inconsistent with the form and density of the earth. If the expression "morning and evening," and the term "day," could possibly be explained figuratively, it could only be on the supposition that this section of the book originally existed as an independent document, and therefore is not necessarily to be subjected in every part to the same laws of interpretation as are to be applied to the Pentateuch in general. Such an explanation assumes that the account is allegorical in respect to the designation of time, but in other respects historical. But if it were an independent document, written by some very ancient patriarch, the fact of its being incorporated into the Pentateuch by Moses, will perhaps be considered as making the assumption of partial allegory forced and unnatural. This would seem to be reasonable, but it is not a necessary inference; for Moses may have incorporated it in his work without the least alteration, just as his venerated ancestor had transmitted the precious document. The Pentateuch itself, as well as other historical books of the Old Testament, affords evidence of this remarkable carefulness of the sacred writers to deliver to posterity the productions of those inspired men who had preceded them, uncorrupted and unaltered, even at the risk of diminishing that uniformity which might at first be expected to reign in one regularly continued work. Still, it is evident that all subsequent sacred writers, who take notice of the creation as a work of six days, do invariably assume a literal and not an allegorical sense of the word 'day.' The other solution of the difficulty may therefore be regarded as the more probable of the two. The first verse may, and most probably does, express the original creation of the mass of matter, and the following represent its condition and subsequent formation. The connexion of the two

accounts in the narrative by no means requires a chronological connexion of the things narrated. The language does undoubtedly allow such an exposition, and the geological facts which are thought to support it are merely the occasion which has led to its adoption. In other words, science has suggested a rule of interpretation, and conducted the inquirer to a deeper investigation of the meaning of scripture.

If the version of Rashi, given in the third note, be allowed to be correct, it will harmonize with this solution. The only point of difference will be this: the one assumes, while the other asserts, a previous creation of the mass of matter of which the world was formed. Both agree in this, that the substance existed when the creation or formation described in the chapter took place, without saying any thing of the time during which it had existed in its unformed state.

Since the preparation of these notes, Dr. JOHN PYE SMITH has published his work "On the Relation between the Holy Scriptures and Some Parts of Geological Science." In one part of his book, the learned author proposes to give such a view of the records in Genesis as shall be consistent with facts as developed and ascertained by geology, and some other departments of physical science. Whether these facts may not be reasonably explained without resorting to such expositions of scripture as he maintains, I leave to the decision of those, who, by uniting a competent acquaintance with physical science to an equally competent knowledge of biblical interpretation, are best qualified to judge. I may be allowed to say, however, that the language of scripture does not appear to me to require the representations which this author has founded on it. The reader's attention is requested to the following extract.

"The Hebrew word רָקִיעַ is commonly translated *firment*, after the example of the Septuagint, (στερεώματα,) but many modern critics have sought to mollify the unphilosophical

idea of a solid concave shell over our head, by using the word *expanse*. No doubt they felt their minds acquiescing in this term as expressing very well the diffused fluid which surrounds the earth; and so leaving us at liberty to conceive of its increasing tenuity, till it is lost in the planetary spaces. But this is the transferring of a modern idea to times and persons which had it not. The word strictly signifies a solid substance, *extended* by beating out, or rolling, or any other mode of working upon a ductile mass.* The old word, *firmament*, was therefore the most proper. Examining the whole subject by connecting it with some passages which have been quoted, and some yet to be mentioned, we acquire an idea of the meteorology of the Hebrews. They supposed that, at a moderate distance above the flight of birds, was a solid concave hemisphere, a kind of dome, transparent, in which the stars were fixed, as lamps; and containing openings, to be used or closed as was necessary. It was understood as supporting a kind of celestial ocean, called ‘the waters above the firmament,’ and ‘the waters above the heavens.’ This was the grand reservoir containing water to be discharged at proper times in rain, with which were connected ‘water-courses, for the overflowing’ or *pouring out*.† The idea also was entertained of masses of water being secured in strong bags, which the clouds were supposed to be.

Thus we read, as one of the works of the Deity, that he ‘tieth up water in his dark cloud, and the cloud beneath them is not torn.’‡ Here also were the ‘treasures of snow, and treasures of hail.’§ Lightning also was conceived of as produced, and then laid by for use, in the same region: and as consisting of some kind of ignited matter, called in scripture ‘coals of fire;’ deriving the idea from burning wood, for

* See Jer. x. 9. † Job xxxviii. 25. ‡ Ib. xxvi. 8. § Ib. xxxviii. 22.

mineral coal they knew not. Of the nature and cause of thunder, the Israelites had no conception; and therefore they referred it immediately to the supreme cause, and called it 'the voice of God.' This idea coincided with the accustomed mode of representing the Deity, by the analogies of the human form." p. 222, 223.

It is not to be doubted, that the Hebrews, in common with other nations of antiquity, were unacquainted with the true theory of physical nature. But it must not be forgotten, that, in common with all nations, they employ popular language, and speak of things as they appear rather than as they are. We do it ourselves in some degree, and doubtless they did it in a much greater. This simple principle does of itself suggest the proper exposition of many passages, and the poetic imagery of the sacred writers will solve any further difficulty which others may be supposed to involve.

If the notion which Dr. Smith has adopted from some older writers respecting the Hebrew idea of "a solid concave hemisphere, &c." had any good foundation in the texts alluded to, it would just as logically follow, that the earth was thought to be supported on "pillars," from such texts as Job ix. 6, xxvi. 11. Ps. lxxv. 3. The idea of water-courses connected with the supposed celestial ocean, and the strong bags identical with the clouds, is about as well supported as that of literal "windows in heaven," and literal "bags," with which the Christian is commanded to provide himself. See Gen. vii. 11, Luke xii. 33. The author might as well have inferred that the Hebrew supposed these rain-bags to be "tied up" with twine or some flexible material. It is extraordinary that he should not have seen and felt at once that *all* this sort of language, as well as the rest which he has cited, is merely poetic, particularly as he proceeds to quote a passage from the eighteenth Psalm, v. 7—15, in

which, as he observes very truly, “we find all the parts of this imagery combined, so as to produce the most magnificent effect.” What he says of lightning being “conceived of as produced, and then laid by for use” in some region, is utterly unfounded. Indeed, a rigid, literal interpretation of certain texts on which the general view avowed by him is maintained, is inconsistent with other representations. That the Hebrews did not consider the heavenly bodies as fixtures, hanging like lamps from a kind of dome, is plain from Job ix. 9, xxxviii. 31, Amos. v. 8, Judg. v. 20, and other places; and certainly the author of the book of Genesis, in saying that “a mist went up from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground,” (ii. 6,) must have had the idea that it came down again in the form of rain.

Dr. Smith gives his view of the Mosaic account of the creation, p. 227 ss. He acknowledges (p. 232,) that the word earth, “when it is conjoined with ‘the heavens,’ denotes the entire created world,” but immediately adds, “it is evident of itself that the practical understanding of the phrase would be in conformity with the ideas of the people who used it,” which is no doubt true. Then, as if to limit still further the application of its sense in the first chapter in general, and in the recapitulation in the first verse of the second, he remarks that the word is often used in a limited sense, which is certainly the case in the Hebrew, and, I presume, in all other languages. He then states his opinion, that “subsequently to the first verse” of the first chapter, “and throughout the whole description of the six days, the word was designed to express *the part of our world which God was adapting for the dwelling of man and the animals connected with him.*” I must profess my conviction that we are not obliged, by the terms made use of, to extend the nar-

* Here and elsewhere the italics are the author's.

native of the six days to a wider application than this ; a description, in expressions adapted to the ideas and capacities of mankind in the earliest ages, of a series of operations, by which the Being of omnipotent wisdom and goodness adjusted and furnished the earth generally, but, as the particular subject under consideration here, a PORTION of its surface for most glorious purposes ; in which a newly-formed creature should be the object of those manifestations of the authority and grace of the Most High, which shall to eternity show forth his perfections above all other methods of their display. This portion of the earth I conceive to have been a large part of Asia, lying between the Caucassian ridge, the Caspian Sea, and Tartary, on the north, the Persian and Indian Seas on the south, and the high mountain ridges which run, at considerable distances, on the eastern and the western flank."

I am compelled to say, that after repeatedly reading this statement, I am at a loss to reconcile its different parts. When the writer speaks of "adjusting and furnishing the earth generally," one would naturally suppose that he intended to denote either the whole or a large proportion of our globe ; but this would be at variance with the words which precede and those immediately following, which limit this operation to "a part of our world, a portion of the earth's surface," which portion he proceeds to define with geographical distinctness. Neither can I understand him to mean, that the Mosaic narrative relates in general to the formation of the whole earth, and particularly to that of this portion. He supposes the previously existing "condition of superficial ruin, or some kind of general disorder, to have been produced by the subsidence of the region." Of course, then, the ruinous disorder would be limited to the portion in question, and the remainder of the earth's surface would need no such adjustment and re-formation.

Such a restricted sense of the term ‘earth,’ when used in connexion with ‘heavens,’ is quite inadmissible; and I cannot but think, that the true principle whereon to explain the narrative in this chapter, is that which has been already suggested, namely, that the formation and arrangement of things are represented to have been as they would have appeared to a supposed human observer stationed on the earth, and so whenever this narrative is referred to in other parts of scripture.

PART II. CHAP. II. 4—IV. 26.

(13.) The former half of this fourth verse is the title to what follows. Drechsler, indeed, p. 78, supposes it to refer to the preceding account as well as to the subsequent; and doubtless, in writing it, the author had in view the narrative before related. But it is a proper title to the account immediately afterwards given, as is also the case in vi. 9, and xi. 27. תולדות, which properly means some accounts of the origin of, and, hence, generations, descents, or genealogical notices, is sometimes used in the sense of history. See xxxvii. 1. The connexion of the two last is evident, as, in all probability, the earliest historical accounts were nothing more than genealogical lists, with brief notices of prominent individuals. The clause may be translated thus: ‘this is an account of the heavens and the earth when they were created.’ The account begins with the next words, which are intimately connected with the fifth verse, as follows: ‘When the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, then any shrub of the field was not yet in the ground, and any grass of the field had not yet sprouted forth; for the Lord God had not caused it to rain, &c.’ This describes the state of things during the time that the process of creation was going on, and the brevity of the account must be supplied from the preceding

narrative, and from the description of the germination and production of vegetables, according to the ordinary course of nature, which immediately follows. In the first chapter, Moses had mentioned the formation of plants on the third day. Now, proceeding to the most ancient history of the earth and of man, he explains in what manner plants were afterwards propagated, and introduces his account by remarking, that they did not originally exist in the dry land, (i. 9, 10.) The γ commencing the sixth verse is adversative, and should be rendered *but*; and that which begins the fifth, serves to introduce the latter part of the sentence, and ought to be translated *then*, as it is in iii. 5, וְנִפְקַחְךָ “*then* your eyes shall be opened.” The reader cannot fail to observe that these two clauses are constructed in the same way, each beginning with the word בְּיוֹם, ‘in the day: in ii. 4, בְּיוֹם עֲשׂוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶרֶץ וְשָׁמַיִם: וְכָל יוֹמֵי הַיּוֹם, ‘in the day of the Lord God’s making the earth and the heavens, *then* every, &c.”; in iii. 5, בְּיוֹם אֲכָלְכֶם מִמֶּנּוּ וְנִפְקַחְךָ עֵינֶיכֶם, “in the day of your eating of it, *then* your eyes shall be opened.” In the former passage, the rabbinical division of the sentence is, of course, disregarded.—It is remarked by Rashi on this place, that טָרָם in scripture always means *not yet*.

(14.) As I see no intimation in the narrative which would lead to the opinion that these trees were allegorical, I adopt the literal view, on the ground that this is always to be preferred, unless the nature of the subject is such as to require a figurative sense.

KENNICOTT, in his “Dissertation on the Tree of Life in Paradise,” (Oxford, 1747,) has endeavored to prove, that no particular tree was intended; but that the phrase is applicable to fruit trees in general, from their natural tendency to preserve life. His essay is more ingenious than satisfactory,

and the translation which he gives to ii. 9, in order to make it agree with his view, does manifest violence to the Hebrew. "And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that was pleasant to the sight, and that was good for food, and a tree of life; and in the midst of the garden the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." This is not only against the Masoretic accentuation, but also against the necessary connexion of וְ with וְעֵץ after וְהָאֵדָמָה. He attempts to vindicate this transfer of וְ from its natural place in the series of the words, by appealing to Gen. xxii. 4, and xxviii. 6; but in both of these cases it precedes a verb with which it is intimately connected, and may be rendered *that*. No less forced is his translation, if it may be called a translation of iii. 22: "Behold, the man hath *behaved*, as if he were equal to one of us, *as to the test* of good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take again of the trees of life, and eat, and *so live on all his days*."

(15.) It is difficult to identify the first two rivers mentioned by Moses. Some have imagined that he means the Nile and the Ganges or Indus, which, with the other two, the Tigris and Euphrates, constitute the four great rivers best known to the ancients. But, on this hypothesis, it is impossible to make the account consistent either with geographical truth, or with that accurate knowledge which the Pentateuch exhibits. Indeed, it seems impossible to explain how any Hebrew writer could have represented the Nile as approximating in its source to the head of either of the others. So gross an ignorance is not to be assumed. Neither is it reasonable to believe, that Moses intended to represent the garden of Eden as a territory of vast extent, comprehending the immense region which a line bordering on the sources of these rivers must necessarily include. Probably the Pison is the Phasis or Phash, which falls into

the Black Sea. The name is said to be derived from the fulness and impetuosity of its stream, and consequently (as might be supposed,) was not limited in its application to this river. Havilah, which this stream is said to wind about, is probably Cholchis, famed among the ancients for its gold. It is uncertain whether the substance afterwards mentioned was a precious gum used as frankincense, or pearls. The Gihon, (so called from גִּיחֹן, to break forth, and therefore applied to various streams, and even to a water-course at Jerusalem, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 30,) is perhaps the Aras or Araxes, which, rising near the source of the Phasis, pursues its south-easterly course to the Caspian. This river is said to wind round the country of Cush, rendered in the common version Ethiopia. Some identify this region with that inhabited by the Cossæi near Media. Others consider it as a comprehensive word applied to southern countries, whether in Asia or Africa. Traces of it may still be discovered in the name Chusistan, a province in Persia. The Hiddekel or Tigris, so called from the rapidity of its current, and the Phrath or Euphrates, are both well known. If this view of the four rivers be correct, the garden of Eden must have been situated in Armenia.

From the tenth verse, it is evident that the four rivers were originally connected. The division of the original stream may well be attributed to some of the various changes to which the surface of the globe has at various times been subjected. Still the question arises, does the language describe what existed in the time of Moses? or does it represent the antediluvian condition? No good reason can be assigned, why the geographical position of Eden should be marked out by topographical phenomena existing before the flood, by a writer posterior to that event. The probability, then, is in favor of the opinion, that Moses describes the locality by marks which admitted of application in his day.

If it be urged as a difficulty in his account, that the deluge must have obliterated all traces of the four rivers into which the paradisaical stream was divided, it may be replied, that there is no reason for admitting such a destruction of the surface of the globe by the flood as the difficulty assumes. Besides, the text does not oblige us to maintain that the division into four principal streams must have existed before the deluge. The representing of one stream running through the garden at the time when our first parents inhabited it, may have suggested to the sacred writer the formation of four rivers from that spot, although they may not have existed until after the flood. That the two facts are stated in immediate connexion in the narrative, is no proof of contemporaneous existence.

“*From thence* it was parted.” The ordinary sense of מִשָּׁם is certainly that of place, if indeed this be not its invariable meaning, as I think is most probable. Hengstenberg denies that it is ever an adverb of time. See the note on Hos. ii. 19, in his *Christologie des Alten Testaments*, Vol. III. p. 103, Keith’s Translation, p. 76. This text is cited by Professor Bush as proving an ‘undoubted indication of time.’ But the particle מִשָּׁם evidently refers to place, namely, “the wilderness” just spoken of in the preceding verse: “from thence,” from that place, “I will give her,” the spiritually returning people, “vineyards.” Clearer still to the same purpose is the only other passage cited by him, Isa. lxv. 20. מִשָּׁם does not here mean “from that time;” it indicates place, the spiritual Jerusalem mentioned in the two preceding verses. Gesenius does indeed represent מִשָּׁם as an adverb of time, referring to this very passage in Hosea, and to Ps. xvi, 5, cxxxii, 17, and Judg. v. 11. But the references are unsatisfactory. The first from the Psalms and that from Judges rather indicate locality, as they plainly imply circumstance, condition: “*there* were they in great fear”;

“*there* shall they rehearse.” The other undoubtedly implies locality: “*there* will I make the horn of David to sprout”; there, namely, in “Zion,” the “rest,” the “habitation” spoken of in v. 13, 14. Isa. xlviii. 16, מֵעַתָּה הַיּוֹרֶה שָׁם אֲנִי seems to support this asserted indication of time, but it is not clearly in favor of it. שָׁם in this place rather appears to correspond with our English usage of ‘there,’ in such phrases as: ‘there is a man, there are some people.’ Thus, the words might be rendered: ‘from the time of its being, there (was) I,’ that is, ‘I was.’ See ROBERTSON’S Thesaurus and COCCÆUS’S Lexicon on the word, both of whom quote from Maimonides שֵׁשׁ שֵׁם נִמְצָא שָׁלֵם, where שֵׁם is thus used: “the first fundamental principle is to believe *that there is a perfect being*.” Comp. Ecc. iii. 17, where our translators have perhaps unnecessarily introduced “there is” in italics, intimating that the original contains no corresponding term: certainly, they have, if the idea is conveyed by שָׁם. In the passage which has suggested these remarks, the connexion with the preceding words necessarily requires the sense of *place*: “A river went out of Eden,” that is, took its rise there, “to water the garden, and *from thence* it was parted.”

(16.) Rosenmüller and some other critics regard the account of the woman’s formation from a part of the man’s substance, (whether this were a portion of his side or one of his ribs,) as an allegory, intended to represent the intimate union and affection of the marriage relation. But it is more consistent with the generally historical character of the contents of the book, to consider the account as that of a real fact. The attempt to give the transaction a ludicrous coloring is but a poor substitution of humor for logic. If the woman were to be created, it is no more an impeachment of the creator’s wisdom to suppose him to have used a portion of the man’s body for the purpose, than it would

be to suppose him to have employed any other materials. The being who was able to produce the result, was able to do it without either pain or even consciousness, were this necessary, in the man. There is nothing in the narrative which requires a resort to parable. Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 8 : "for the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man"; from which it is probable that St. Paul alludes to this account; and if so, he evidently regards it as a historical fact.

(17.) This is undoubtedly the language of the inspired author, as is intimated in Matt. xix. 4, 5, where it is introduced as a divine declaration. The expression of Adam is contained in the preceding verse.

The hypothesis has been advanced, that the second chapter, with the exception of the first three verses, is a separate and independent account of the creation. But it is destitute of any solid basis. The designation of the Deity by the expression "Lord God," while the term "God" was before employed, has often been appealed to in proof of the independent origin of these portions of Genesis. But this argument can hardly be thought of much weight, as these various appellations may be designedly chosen in reference to their genuine meaning, or the use of them may be incidental, or the same writer may habitually use different words at different times. In some places the terms appear to be used indiscriminately. The subject has already been treated of in the Introduction. Rosenmüller, who once attached great importance to the argument drawn from the use of these different terms, afterwards abandoned it as untenable. Neither is the apparent repetition in part of the narrative of the creation any stronger. For, either it is a retrospective reference to what was before related, and is intended to introduce something new, as in v. 18 ss.; or it is essential to

a clear view of the statement which the author designed to make, as in v. 7. The remainder of the portion consists altogether of additional matter.

(18.) The notion of Rosenmüller, that the narrative describes the first influence of reason as an active principle, which had before lain dormant as it were in the human constitution, and now shows itself as the source of misery, simultaneously with animal propensity, is an extravagant hypothesis, alike revolting in its character and unsupported by the representation made in the chapter. It assumes, moreover, that when God made man in his own image, and gave him "dominion over the other works of his hands," (Ps. viii. 6. Gen. i. 26—28,) he placed the ruler of this lower world in the happy condition of early infancy, (*"primæ infantiae fœlix simplicitas."*) SCHILLER also represents man in his original state as acting merely under the influence of instinct. 'But he breaks away from the leading strings of nature's cradling season, and then by the exercise of reason is to seek again that state of innocence which he had lost.' Thus our first parent's disobedience to the divine law is nothing else than 'a falling away from his instinct, the first daring effort of his reason, the very commencement of his moral being': ein Abfall von seinem Instinkte—erstes Wagestück seiner Vernunft, erster Anfang seines moralischen Daseyn. The philosopher admits that thus moral evil was brought into the creation, but maintains that it was only with the view of making moral good possible; and therefore he regards the fact 'as the happiest and greatest event in the history of man'! Dieser Abfall des Menschen vom Instinkte, der das moralische Uebel zwar in die Schöpfung brachte, aber nur um das moralische Gute darin möglich zu machen, ist ohne Widerspruch die glücklichste und grösste Begebenheit in der Menschengeschichte. See his treatise,

entitled, *Etwas über die erste Menschengesellschaft nach dem Leitfaden der Mosaischen Urkunde*, section first, which bears the title : ‘Transition of man to *freedom and humanity*’ ! Uebergang des Menschen zur Freyheit und Humanität. The treatise may be found in the 16th volume of Schiller’s Collected Works, Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1819. A believer in the inspiration of the history, or even in the truth of the facts related, would find it impossible to reconcile such views with his faith. Can it be thought that the benevolent author of our being would have subjected the first human pair to a trial of virtue, the result of which has had an influence on the condition of their posterity, when the power of reasoning on the case was just beginning to develop itself? As such a supposition is incompatible with general sentiment and feeling, so it is also inconsistent with the whole representation in the book of Genesis. This describes the fall of our progenitors from a state of innocence and happiness to one of guilt and misery, in consequence of their voluntary transgression of God’s known law, established as a method of probation and a test of obedience.

(19.) That נָחָשׁ signifies a serpent is almost universally admitted. The use of the word, the authority of the old versions, and eastern tradition, incontrovertibly determine this meaning.—Of the various views which have been taken of this chapter, it will be sufficient for my purpose to state the most important ; leaving the candid reader to form his own judgment respecting the degree of probability to which they are respectively entitled. Each is correct in presuming the fact of the fall to be the prominent point of the narrative.*

* The reader who is desirous to see what curious and learned critics have thought, reasoned, and conjectured on this subject, is

The first view to be mentioned is that which maintains the action of a real serpent, and denies any other agent to be intended as a tempter. This opinion has had learned advocates. It is maintained by the Jewish commentator, ABARBANEL, supported by SIMEON DE MUIS in the *Critici Sacri*, Tom. I. p. 148, and sanctioned by DATHE, in his note (c.) on iii. 1, and HERDER in his second letter on the Study of Theology, *Briefe, das Studium der Theologie betreffend*, in his *Collected Works*, published at Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1829, Vol. XIII. p. 26. These writers suppose the temptation to have consisted in the serpent's repeatedly using the fruit in Eve's presence, without visible injury, perhaps with apparently increased powers, and thus exciting in her the inclination to follow his example. The influence of this example, and the thoughts that consequently arose in her mind, are represented, agreeably to the genius of oriental and figurative language, under the image of a conversation. In opposition to this hypothesis, it has been urged, that so poetic a representation of the simple act of the serpent's eating the fruit and thereby giving rise to thoughts and inclinations in the woman's mind, is inconsistent with the narrative style of the whole work, in which poetic machinery can have little or no place. And great weight ought to be attached to the fact, that another agent in the temptation is evidently contemplated by the earliest Jewish authority, and in the New Testament. This will be more particularly exhibited hereafter.

The second view regards the devil as the principal agent, who, in accomplishing his scheme, employed the serpent as his instrument. Thus the latter appears to reason and speak; the woman converses with him, and is led by the

referred to the dissertations of FRISCHMUTH, PASCHUS, and DE HASE, published in the *Thesaurus Theologico-Philologicus*, Fol. Amst. Pars prima, pp. 55—95.

artful representations which the devil enables him to make, to break the divine law. The sentence which afterwards follows, is to be explained in reference to both the agents. This is the view which has been most generally adopted by divines, and is supposed to meet all the requisitions of the case, and to accord with the representations elsewhere made in scripture and early Jewish writings. It is defended by Hengstenberg in his *Christology*, Vol. I. p. 26 ss.

There are difficulties in this view of the transaction, which appear to some irreconcilable with truth as deduced from other parts of scripture and supported by reason. They find it difficult to perceive how the supreme being could allow such a series of circumstances to go into operation, in order to try the virtue of our first parents, consistently with the views of divine providence and goodness as generally exhibited in the Bible. Let it be observed, that the difficulty in contemplation does not lie in the fact of their being permitted to be tempted. Sound reasons are given for this. So far as we know, the trial of virtue may be essential to the highest excellence of every created intelligence, and may be allowed in order to produce the greatest amount of moral character. Neither does the difficulty lie in the particular test selected. The establishment of a character of implicit obedience to the will of God simply as such, was intended to be the result; and the prohibition of the fruit of a particular tree was as well fitted for this purpose as any prohibition or demand whatever. But, on the hypothesis under consideration, the great enemy of God and goodness, filled with jealousy at the happiness of the first pair, contrives a plan to ruin this happiness, to bring sin and misery into the world, and thus to mar the harmony and beauty of the almighty maker's workmanship; and in carrying this plan into effect, *he works a series of miracles,*

speaking by means of the serpent's organs, thus abusing one of God's good creatures,* by making him the instrument in the destruction of another, and that other no less a personage than the lord of this lower world, the father of the whole human family. This is the point, the miraculous character of the action, which is thought to be an insuperable objection. It is impossible to doubt that the facts stated on this hypothesis do imply miracles, unless, indeed, the old fable of inferior animals having been endowed with the faculties of reason and speech be renewed in order to meet the difficulty.† How many others this would involve, it were a waste of time to point out. Whether any of the spiritual agents in the universe, however exalted, possesses natural powers adequate to such miraculous result, may admit of doubt. On the question connected with this remark, men of profound thought and acute powers of reasoning have differed;‡ so that we cannot assume the devil's

* As all of God's creatures were good in their respective kinds, (see Gen. i. 31,) the intimation of Horsley, (Biblical Criticism, Vol. I. p. 17,) that "the tempter assumed perhaps by necessity the form of the serpent, *being permitted to assume no better than that of a mean reptile*," is not admissible. The contemptuous designation of the animal is in striking contrast with the notion of those who figure to themselves some glorious creature of remarkable beauty and splendor, who is afterwards compelled to suffer degradation of nature and form, as a consequence of his having been forcibly made the instrument of the evil spirit's wicked machinations!

† See the passages from Plato and the Sybilline Oracles quoted by BOCHART in his Phaleg, Lib. I. cap. i. xv. p. 3, 50, Edit. Tert. Lug. Bat. 1692. Abundance of Talmudic and Rabbinical nonsense on this subject may be found in EISENMENGER'S *Entdecktes Judenthum*, Theil I. cap. viii. p. 419 ss.; although the author seems to give the most ridiculous construction of the Jewish representations, some of which are perhaps figurative.

‡ On this point see HUGH FARMER'S Dissertation on Miracles, on the one side; and, on the other, the Bishop of Clogher's (CLAYTON'S)

inability to employ the serpent, as the view of the transaction supposes him to have done. But whatever opinions may be held by different persons respecting the nature of miracles and the power necessary to work them, none who believe in the being and attributes of God can deny that all such power must be under his control, and cannot be used except by his permission. In the language of Dr. JORTIN, "God will not permit evil spirits to delude wise and good men to their hurt."

The questions, then, which every inquirer after truth, who determines to make up his mind deliberately and impartially on this important topic, must settle, are these: 'Does this account of the temptation and fall of our first parents necessarily imply that the devil possesses power to work miracles? and if he does, that the Deity would allow him to exert it for such a purpose, and under the circumstances of the case?''* If an affirmative answer to the former of these questions should even be allowed, the latter, it is said, can admit of no other than a negative reply, consistently with the general views of scripture and the fair results of unbiassed reasoning. Under the influence of these and other considerations, the truth of the view in contemplation is questioned by some, who are conscientious and serious believers in revelation.

The third view to be stated supposes the devil to be the only agent in effecting the temptation, and that whatever is

Chronology of the Hebrew Bible Vindicated, p. 252 ss.; HORSLEY'S Sermon on Mark vii. 37; JORTIN'S Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, Lond. 1805, Vol. II. p. 1 ss.; and LE CLERC on Exod. vii. 11.

* That any one should suppose the Deity himself to have wrought the miracle, is too preposterous to be taken into consideration. Neither is it of any consequence to examine the question, in what light Eve herself would have regarded the transaction, and whether her knowledge of the natural powers of the brute creation were sufficient to enable her to ascertain the truth.

said respecting the serpent is figurative. It is worthy of notice, that the sacred books of the ancient Persians represent the evil principle as tempting the parents of the human race,* and as coming to earth in the form of a serpent.† And it is yet more important, that the Jewish tradition and the New Testament speak of the devil as the tempter, and represent him under the same figure. In the book of Wisdom, ii. 24, we find the expression, “through envy of the devil came death into the world;” and in *Bereshith Rabba*, (an old and extensive commentary,) the book *Sohar*, and other Jewish authorities, *Sammael*, by whom is meant the devil, is represented as the serpent by whom Eve was deceived. See the passages in *SCHOETTGEN*’s *Horæ Hebraicæ*, on John viii. 44, and Rev. xii. 7, 9; also, in *EISENMENGER*’s *Entdecktes Judenthum*, Theil I. cap. xviii. p. 831 ss. Thus in Rev. xii. 9. xx. 2, the devil is called “the great dragon” and “that old serpent”; (the נחש הקדמוני of the Jewish writers;) and also, without an epithet, “the dragon” and “the serpent.” See xii. 13—17. And it cannot reasonably be doubted, say the advocates of this view, that in the same figurative sense the word is used without an epithet by St. Paul: “as the serpent beguiled Eve,” 2 Cor. xi. 3. In John viii. 44, our Lord calls the devil “a manslayer from the beginning,” which, in its most natural meaning, refers to him as the original tempter by whom sin and death were brought into the world. The agency of the devil in the temptation of the first human pair, seems therefore to be evidently the doctrine of the New Testament and of the ancient Jewish church. And it is equally evident, that the tempter is him-

* See *KLEUKER*’s *Zendavesta* in *AUGUST HAHN*’s *Lehrbuch des Christlichen Glaubens*, Leip. 1828, p. 347 ss.

† *Zend.* in *HENGSTENBERG*, ubi sup. p. 29, 30, and *KEITH*’s *Translation*, p. 29.

self designated by the term used in the original record under consideration.

If now, say they who defend this third view, the inspired author of this record should have intended to denote no other agent, the difficulties which otherwise embarrass the narrative are removed. By the permission, yet under the control of God, the devil tempts our first parents to transgress the law which had been imposed as the test of obedience. He holds communication with the woman, and induces her to suspect the truth of the divine threatening, and to believe that participation in the fruit would be attended with a vast increase of angelic and perhaps of divine knowledge. These real facts of the case are represented under the veil of allegory. The serpent is selected to represent the devil on account of his proverbial cunning, and because of the very general antipathy with which this class of animals is regarded by mankind. That part of the curse which is generally supposed to have been denounced against the reptile itself, is in fact meant for the devil. The language is such as would have been employed had a real serpent been intended; but this is consistent with the parabolical character of the representation, and even necessary in order to sustain it. That such language presents no real objection to the view which they endeavor to defend, they maintain must be allowed by all who put a figurative construction on the latter part of the curse: "it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." But this is done by the whole body of orthodox commentators; and, indeed, with the best reason, as a literal interpretation would be miserably frigid, utterly unworthy of the solemn occasion, and highly inconsistent with the infinite dignity of the speaker, and the awful condition of the parties addressed. The expression: "on thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life," does not necessarily imply a change of form or

outward appearance, and a literal use of dust for food. The former must not be assumed, for a large proportion of reflecting readers will regard it as improbable;* and the latter is obviously untrue, as serpents cannot be said to feed on dust, any more than other animals who take their food from the ground. The language denotes great degradation, utter subjection, the most abject prostration in the presence of a triumphant opposing power. See Ps. lxxii. 9. cii. 10. Isa. xlix. 23, where the phrase, “to eat” or “lick the dust,” can have no other meaning. The verbs אָכַל and לָחַץ are both used in this connexion. See the second reference to the Psalms, and compare Micah vii. 17.

The objections to this view and the arguments to prove that a real serpent must be intended, may be identified. It is necessary to examine them, and as they are urged by Hengstenberg, I shall state them in his language.

“It is beyond all doubt, that a real serpent was engaged in the temptation, and consequently the opinion of those must be rejected, who regard the serpent as merely a symbolical designation of the evil spirit. This opinion would

* The notion of several Jewish and Christian expositors, (see Frischmuth's Dissertation before referred to, cap. I. § 22,) that the creature was originally provided with legs, which on this occasion were cut off, (רגלים היו לו ונקצצו, Rashi;) and that of some other commentators, that its primitive form was splendid and imposing, similar to that in which a seraph would display himself, are alike unfounded in the narrative or meaning of the word, and, I think, equally unreasonable. An old Jewish gloss quoted by Maimonides, in his More Nevochim, Part II. chap. 30, fol. 43, (ג) Berl. edition, 1795, and in Buxtorf's Translation. p. 280, 281, may be regarded as the climax of such fancies. Here it is said, that the serpent was an animal as large as a camel, that it might be ridden on, that Sammael, which is another term for Satan, rode on it when Eve was deceived, and that the term employed in the text designates both agents. See the Proteuangelium Paradisiacum of CHRISTOPHER HELVICUS, p. 15, in the Critici Sacri, Tom. I. Pars II., at the end of the volume; and compare HOLDEN's Dissertation on the Fall, chap. II. sect. 6, p. 118.

make it necessary, in order to be consistent, that we should adopt the allegorical mode of interpretation throughout the whole narrative. For in a connected paragraph like this, uniformity of interpretation must prevail, and we are not at liberty, in the same historical relation, to adopt at one time the allegorical or symbolical, and at another the simple and literal method. Against the allegorical interpretation of the whole, there are many objections, as the connexion with what follows, where the history of the same human pair which are brought into view is carried forward,—the accurate geographical description of paradise,—the fact, that the condition of mankind threatened in this narrative as a punishment, actually exists,—the absence of every indication from which it might be inferred that the author designed to write an allegory and not a history,—the passages in the New Testament, where the account of the fall is referred to as a real history, 2 Cor. xi. 3, 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14, Rom. v. 12,—the embarrassment, uncertainty, and capriciousness of the allegorical interpreters, when they attempt to exhibit the truth intended to be conveyed, which, if the author had designed his composition for an allegory, must have been so obvious as to be easily discovered.

The presence of a real serpent is proved, moreover, not only by the remark, chap. iii. 1, “now the serpent was more subtile than any beast of the field,” but by the punishment denounced, which must necessarily refer, in the first instance to the serpent.” Christology, p. 26 s.

It is not my intention to express any decided opinion in favor of the third view now under consideration; but it must be obvious that the remarks which have already been made, supply an answer to several of those objections of Hengstenberg. Some of the others are irrelative to the view itself, and can only apply to the neological, mythic representation of the facts contained in the first portions of

Genesis. The reply to the remainder will immediately occur to every reflecting mind. The author assumes the very principle in question, namely, that consistency requires the whole narrative and representation to be regarded as an allegory, or else denies any part of it to be such. It is assumed also by HORSLEY, in his *Biblical Criticism*, Vol. I. p. 9, 10, and 17. But this is not to be conceded. Many objections, and unanswerable, there truly are to an allegorical interpretation of the whole, and of the history which follows. But there is no necessity for this. The statements made both before and after the narrative in question are so stamped with the very image of historical fact, that it would be impossible to view them in any other light without a manifest perversion of their meaning. And it is maintained by those who defend this hypothesis, that the account of the fall is also a real history, as it is represented to be in the New Testament. This is the question for consideration: ‘Is this real history of the fall of our first parents into sin, through the instigation of the devil, whereby they were led to disobey God, related in language partly allegorical or wholly literal?’ It must be obvious to every candid mind; that the reply to this question has no bearing whatever on the fact of the fall or the doctrines deducible from it. Whether it be answered in the affirmative or negative, these will continue the same. There may be “embarrassment, uncertainty, and capriciousness in the attempts of some to exhibit the truth intended to be conveyed,” but they are not essential to a partly allegorical interpretation.

A resort to allegory might be defended on the ground of necessity; and consequently where the necessity does not exist, the narrative is to be explained literally. If the necessity be allowed to exist in some parts of a narrative and not in others, “uniformity of interpretation” cannot be demanded. The intermixture of the literal and the figurative

in immediate connexion, and without any intimation except what the nature of the case suggests, is very usual in scripture. See Matt. viii. 22, "let the dead bury their dead;" 1 Thess. iv. 16, 1 Pet. iv. 5, 6, and particularly the literal clause in the sixteenth verse of the 80th Psalm, "they perish at the rebuke of thy countenance," in connexion with the immediately preceding beautiful allegory of the "vine brought out of Egypt." Does any interpreter hesitate to explain the address of Jotham to the men of Shechem in the ninth chapter of Judges, partly as an allegory or parable, (v. 8—15,) and partly according to the literal sense of the words? (v. 16—20.) Every reader feels that necessity demands this, as the literal sense involves an absurdity. And on the same principle, the view under consideration gives an allegorical sense to what is ascribed to the serpent, because a literal one is thought to involve a difficulty in reference to the moral character of God, and an inconsistency with scripture and reason. "If," says Mr. Holden,* "it could be satisfactorily established that Satan, without using any animal as an organ, deceived Eve, and that in consequence 'the serpent' is a figurative and symbolical name given to him by Moses, it would not overturn the literal interpretation. The account may be equally literal and authentic, notwithstanding a few metaphorical expressions or symbolical terms. If the devil be called הַנָּחָשׁ, therefore, it will be no reason for turning the whole into allegory. The only difference which this circumstance will make in our interpretation is, that, in the one case the part ascribed to this הַנָּחָשׁ, and the commination of it, will belong both to the devil and the material serpent, and, in the other, to the devil alone; but the history will be equally true and literal. The younger Vitringa, who espouses the

* Dissertation on the Fall of Man, p. 401, 402.

notion that Satan used no brute animal, contends at some length, and very ably, that it does not militate against the literal and historical sense. See *Diss. de Serpente Veteratore*, cap. iv. § 3, et seq.”

Perhaps it may be thought by some, that this third view does not entirely remove the difficulty, and that, on the supposition of the presence and agency of the devil in the temptation, a miracle must be implied. But this is by no means a necessary consequence. It is certainly the doctrine of the New Testament, that the devil does now tempt men to sin; but no believer in this scriptural doctrine regards such agency as miraculous. It is according to the ordinary course of nature, as now existing, both as regards the tempter and the tempted. And such temptation may be all that the narrative under consideration states. The language ascribed to the devil need not have been uttered in articulate sounds. To give such a meaning of the phraseology: “and the serpent said unto the woman,” &c. &c., it is enough to maintain, that *the tempter suggested the thought which the words convey*. In the communication of the thought, the essence of his temptation lies, and not in the fact of its having been embodied in language. To illustrate this remark by specific references must be unnecessary, as the scripture abounds with such language, which cannot possibly escape the notice of an attentive reader; and the first chapter of Genesis is a continual exemplification of the principle, as the phrase “and God said,” which occurs so frequently, is generally allowed to denote the determination of his will, and not to signify its oral declaration. The tempting sentiment did not originate with the woman; it was not the natural working of her own mind; it was a suggestion made by the great enemy of God and goodness.

But it will perhaps be said: can the woman be imagined to address herself to the tempter, or in any way to com-

municate her thoughts to him, unless he were visibly present? In reply, it may be asked, wherein lies the difficulty of allowing that she might, his real presence being of course understood? Whenever a communication was made by a spiritual being, whether the infinitely holy one himself or some one of his angels, and replied to by the party to whom it was made, is it to be taken for granted, that a visible form had been assumed, whereby to make such communication?—that the practicability of conveying sentiments, and of replying to them, depended on the visibility of the principal agent? The advocates of the third view might reasonably apprehend, that but few would maintain such a position as this. Does any one imagine that a visible form appeared to Samuel, when he mistook the voice that called him for that of Eli? 1 Sam. iii. 4—10. When the law was given on Mount Sinai, the Hebrews “heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only they heard a voice, they saw no manner of similitude.” Deut. iv. 12, 15. And when the Lord Jesus arrested the progress of Saul, and called to him in an audible voice, to which the persecutor replied orally and received oral directions, it is expressly said, that “the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, *hearing a voice but seeing no one*, *μηδέν α δὲ θεωροῦντες.*” Acts ix. 7. And if visibility be not necessary in regard to one spiritual being, why, it might be asked, is its necessity assumed in regard to another? The moral character of either cannot be supposed to affect the analogy of the cases. “We know not, and perhaps cannot comprehend the mode of communication between spiritual essences.” Holden on the Fall, p. 172.

On the other hand it may be replied: ‘although the visibility of the spiritual agent be not contended for, the real miraculous character of the agency is, in the latter instances, undeniable. When the word of the Lord is revealed to

Abraham or any other prophet; when God tries the father of the faithful, and, at the end of the trial, calls to him out of heaven; there is, as was doubtless the case at our Lord's baptism and transfiguration, and on the occasion mentioned in John xii. 28, and in that of Saul's conversion, an audible voice, a real miraculous agency.' All this is true; but whether the cases are sufficiently analogous to that of Eve's temptation, to afford ground for an argument from the one to the other, may admit of some doubt. If the temptation were addressed to her by the devil in a visible appearance, and conveyed by oral declaration, we should not even then too hastily infer that a communication so made, was, at the period in contemplation, contrary to the course of things then subsisting, and, therefore, miraculous in the sense in which it would be to us in the present day. It may be, that angelic beings held frequent intercourse with the first human pair. And if this were so, the seducer may have presented himself to Eve, as readily as any of his brethren who had retained their original condition, and the interchange of thought between him and the woman may have been made in the same way, whether oral or otherwise, as was usual on other occasions when angels communicated with them.

The difficulties of the subject, and the very imperfect data within our reach, must suggest to every serious inquirer the duty of taking impartial views, and of avoiding hasty decisions and crude speculations, founded in fancy, rather than careful investigation of inspired truth.

(20.) To open the eyes is a phrase denoting increase of knowledge. It is thus used of Hagar, when the well is pointed out to her, (Gen. xxi. 19,) and of the disciples who were made to recognize their master at Emmaus, (Luke xxiv. 31.)

(21.) "The seed" or posterity of the woman (v. 15,) denotes mankind, comprehending of course the Saviour himself, the greatest of all her offspring. The miraculous character of his birth cannot be proved to be intimated by the phrase, for one entirely analogous is applied to man in general. See Job xiv. 1. "The seed" or progeny of the serpent, are the children of the devil; that is, agreeably to the scriptural use of the word child or son, those who are like him in temper and disposition, and whose interests are identified with his. It may comprehend, therefore, all incorrigibly wicked men and evil angels. The right of obdurate sinners of mankind to be regarded as descendants of the woman, connected with her and claiming the promise, is virtually denied, and such enemies of God are placed in the ranks to which they properly belong: "they are of their father the devil," John viii. 44. Here then are two distinct classes; the partizans of the kingdom of darkness headed by Satan, and those of Eve's posterity who "are on the Lord's side," together with the great Redeemer himself, with whom they are united in character and interests.

In determining the general meaning of the prediction in this verse, it is not necessary to settle the original meaning of the word שׁוֹיֵךְ. It may be, according to Gesenius and Umbreit, the same as that of שָׁאֵף, 'to pant after,' and hence may mean, 'to lie in wait for'; or it may come from the Arabic شَارَ, and mean, as Dathe says, 'to look out for with raised head,' (comp. the Greek ἀποκαζαδοκία, earnest expectation;) or else from سَارَ, 'to scent out.' Onkelos seems to have followed this derivation in the latter clause, which he renders thus: וְאַתָּה וְהָיִי-נֶטֶר לְיֵהּ לְסוֹפֵא, 'and thou shalt watch for him at the end.' So also the Septuagint, αὐτὸς σε τηρήσει κεφαλὴν, καὶ σὺ τηρήσεις αὐτὸν πτέρναν, and the Vulgate: et tu insidiaberis calcaneo ejus. STORR, in his *Opuscula Acade-*

micah, Vol. II. p. 416 ss., defends another meaning of the Arabic word, viz. 'to come close to,' and deduces this as the sense of the text: "it (the progeny of the woman) shall come close to thy head, that is, shall attack it with hostile intent and not in vain, but thou shalt come close to his heels, shalt come under them, shalt be trampled under foot." See p. 419, s. But this exposition takes the same word in the two clauses in opposite senses; the former conveying the idea of successful hostility, the latter of complete prostration under the power of the foe. In Chaldee, the word means, 'to wear away, to grind to dust, to scrape, to file,' like חָפַץ and חָפַץ. Whatever may be the primitive meaning of the root, the idea here conveyed in both clauses is that of hostility; and this sense agrees with the only two other places in which the word occurs in scripture: Job ix. 17, "he breaketh me with a tempest," he assaileth me with hostile fury; and Ps. cxxxix. 11, where it is used metaphorically, 'darkness shall assail me,' shall overwhelm, crush me down, as it were. The degree of injury to be sustained by the respective parties is obviously implied in the terms 'head' and 'heel.' As the head is the seat of life, the assailing and crushing of it express complete destruction of vital energy, entire prostration of the adversary. The antithetic phrase conveys, of course, the idea of injury comparatively trifling.

The promise in this verse does undoubtedly imply the doctrine of a Saviour, who should deliver the posterity of Eve from the effects of the fall, and destroy the power of the tempter; so that it may well be regarded as the first annunciation of the Gospel, involving its great and fundamental truth. But it is conveyed in figurative language, and, like many very early predictions, is obscure. How far our first parents understood its import, we are unable to say. Where the scriptures have withheld information in such points, it were folly to affect knowledge.

(22.) That death in the ordinary sense of the word, meaning the separation of the soul and body, is here intended, is too plain to need proof. Whether any more comprehensive sense is implied on the supposition of subsequent rejection of mercy offered through a Saviour, it is not consistent with the plan of these notes to examine. Doubtless such a sense is a scriptural truth, whether it be taught in this history or gathered exclusively from other places. As the death which is here plainly threatened, is the natural result of that mortal state which was the immediate effect of the transgression, the language of the original sanction, "the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," admits of an easy interpretation, as the cause of dissolution then commenced its operations, and at that very time man became mortal.

(23.) Eve, in Hebrew חַוְוָה, equivalent to חַיָּה, life. The name was probably imposed some time after, when the descendants of the first pair had become considerably numerous.

(24.) The language of the text, "the Lord God made coats of skins," is to be explained on the principle, the use of which is so common in scripture, whereby an action is ascribed to an indirect and remote cause. The meaning is, he instructed our first parents to make themselves garments. BERGER, indeed, in his *Praktische Einleitung*, Vol. I. p. 63, considers this and other representations contained in the first chapters of Genesis, as illustrative of the author's gross and imperfect conceptions of the divine nature. But it is not true, that the narrative represents God as making man "cloaths with his own hand," to use this writer's indecorous language. It might as well be said, that Jacob himself made the coat of Joseph. *Comp. xxxvii. 3.*

(25.) VITRINGA,* and some other critics, suppose the language in the former part of v. 22 to be ironical, implying, that the tempter's promise (v. 5,) had failed to result in any thing but misery. But the knowing of good and evil, that is, the practical and experimental acquaintance with evil in contradistinction to good, was an effect of the fall, and the comparison here made need not be carried out beyond the single point of an increase of knowledge. Before, the man was happily ignorant of evil and innocent of its effects; now he is practically acquainted with it in contradistinction to good. The supposition of irony is hardly consistent with the solemnity of the occasion. The phrase, "like one of us," is explained by some in reference to the plurality of persons in the Deity. It seems reasonable to give it the same sense as the corresponding phrase in v. 5, "ye shall be **כְּאֱלֹהִים**." The Septuagint renders this, 'like gods,' *ὡς θεοί*, and this is followed by the Vulgate, "sicut dii." The Chaldee translates **כְּרַבְרָבִין** 'like great ones,' and the Arabic **كَامَلَالِيكَةٍ**, 'like the angels'; the Syriac alone uses the singular number, **כְּאֱלֹהִים**, 'like God.' Our English translation, "like gods," follows the Septuagint, and means, most probably, like divine beings, in other words, like angels. Thus the word **אֱלֹהִים** is used in Ps. viii. 6, where it is rendered by the Sept. *ἄγγελοι*, a version which is adopted by St. Paul in Heb. ii. 7, and undoubtedly gives the sense of the original, although it is not a literal translation. The view suggested by Rashi, and presented in the note on i. 26, illustrates the phrase, 'like one of us.'

The account of the Cherubim, glorious celestial beings, who were appointed to guard the entrance into paradise, is

* See his Dissertation, de arbore prudentiæ in Paradiso, in his *Observationes Sacræ*, Lib. iv. cap. xii. § iv. p. 1047.

regarded by Michaelis and Dathe as a poetic description of thunder and lightning. Comp. Ps. xviii. 9—15. But this is at variance with the context, which is historical; and it is not required by any difficulties in the case, as such a procedure could not but strike a salutary awe into the minds of the offenders, fill them with concern for having transgressed God's law, and thus deepen their penitential emotions. The "flaming sword turning itself every way" denotes the efficiency of the method employed, and the utter impracticability of counteracting the divine intentions. It is probable that the expedient for preventing access to the tree of life, continued in operation but a short time.

(26.) As the scriptures uniformly derive the existence of all mankind from Adam and Eve,* it is evident that their descendants must have been considerably numerous at the time of this transaction. The imperfect notices of Cain's apprehension after the divine judgments had been denounced against him, and of his subsequent conduct, (v. 14—16,) are sufficient to establish this point; and it is quite consistent with the remarkable brevity which characterizes the early part of Genesis. It was not the author's intention to give an entire history of the family of our first parents, but to select those incidents to which more than ordinary interest was attached, or which were most immediately adapted to advance the true knowledge and worship of God. Cain may have been Adam's first-born; but this is uncertain. The language in v. 1, merely states that his mother gave him a name expressive of acquisition, but whether he was the first treasure of this sort given to his parents, or one

* The variety of species existing among the human race may not, indeed, have yet been satisfactorily explained; but certainly, it affords no proof of the opinion of distinct races derived from different originals. See Wiseman's third and fourth Lectures, which are devoted to this subject.

subsequently added to the social circle, we are not informed. The words *וְיָהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ* mean ‘with,’ ‘by,’ or “from the Lord,” and denote Eve’s pious recognition of the agency of divine providence in giving her this son. Thus, they are well explained by the Septuagint, *διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ*, and this is followed by the Vulgate, *per Deum*. *אֱלֹהֵינוּ* may be elliptical for *אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* (comp. xlix. 25. 2 Kings xxiii. 35,) or it may be taken in the sense of ‘with.’ See Gesenius, II. 2. The notion that Eve believed this son to be the promised Messiah, and avows his divinity by calling him Jehovah, is utterly unfounded, and assumes a measure of religious knowledge, which there is no proof that she possessed. As the name of Abel means vanity, if it were imposed immediately on his birth, it was probably selected on account of some unknown contemporaneous circumstances illustrative of the vain and uncertain character of human expectations. It is unnecessary to say how well the designation corresponds with his melancholy death.

(27.) This is the sole ground on which the scripture rests the procedure of God in reference to the offerings of these two brothers. It was “faith” that made Abel’s acceptable, (Heb. xi. 4,) that principle of holy obedience, which, under all dispensations, (Heb. iv. 2, 3,) was the condition of favor. The faith eulogized in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, is a confident expectation of what God hath promised, and a firm conviction of the truth of whatever he hath revealed; and it leads to an uniform acquiescence in whatever he requires. This faith was Abel’s, whether it acted on revealed views of an atoning Saviour to come, or on any other declarations communicated from heaven. And it would be equally acceptable in either case, plainly because in either case it would have originated in the same inward character. It has been confidently said, that the faith of Abel prompted him to the choice of an animal sacrifice, in obedience to a divine institution, and that

he thereby showed that his hopes were founded on an atonement to be made at some future time by the promised Messiah. Certainly it were rash to assert the contrary. But where is the proof that Abel was so fully acquainted with the divine plan for the redemption of mankind? Doubtless he believed in the promise made to his parents, but we have no evidence to satisfy us that he knew the manner in which it was to be accomplished; and where the oracles of God are silent, it is wise in human expositors not to affect knowledge. The notion that his animal sacrifice was made in addition to such an offering as Cain presented, was advanced by Kennicott; but it is unsupported, either by the original language of the text, (v. 4,) or by that in Heb. xi. 4, to which appeal has been made. The word הִנְחָלָה offering, on which Kennicott lays great stress, is not confined, as he assumes it to be, to “an oblation of the fruit of the ground, or an unbloody, in opposition to a bloody sacrifice,” but is often used for gift in general, and, in the latter part of v. 4, is certainly exegetical of the firstlings and fat of the flock. Undoubtedly it would not be maintained, that Abel’s “offering” which God respected, did not comprehend the animal victim; as this, according to the hypothesis, was the very thing that gave it value, and showed the offerer’s faith. That πλεῖονα, in Heb. xii. 4, is used of character rather than number, is in itself altogether probable; and it is strange, that Dr. Kennicott should say, “that πλεῖων has not the sense of præstantior through the whole New Testament.” See his Dissertation on the oblations of Cain and Abel, p. 197, 198. Matt. xii. 41, 42, are clear instances of this meaning. It must be said, that several of Kennicott’s criticisms are far-fetched and unfounded.—See Magee on the Atonement, No. LXII.

As Abel’s faith made his offering acceptable, the want of it, proved by the want of obedience, caused the rejection of

Cain's. The character of this man is intimated with sufficient distinctness by the expostulation of God in v. 7, "if thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? (or perhaps, more in accordance with the Hebrew: 'shall there not be elevation'? in reference to what is said in v. 5, at the end :) "and if thou doest not well, &c." It is not to be supposed that such an address would be made to a righteous person. If the language of the narrative were consistent with any doubt on this point, that of the New Testament would entirely remove it. We are told by St. John, (1 Ep. iii. 12,) that "Cain was of the wicked one," and that "he slew his brother, because his own works were evil and his brother's righteous." See also Jude 11. As the scriptural account of these two persons sufficiently explains the grounds of the divine procedure in reference to each, sound philosophy, as well as common sense, prohibits the indulgence of useless speculation.

It seems most probable, from the connexion of the verse which mentions the occupation of the two brothers with those which specify the sort of offerings which they made, (2—4,) that the latter was the natural result of the former. But this opinion by no means implies that of the human origin of sacrifices. Whether they be regarded as ceremonies indicative of covenant relation, or as gifts recognizing divine authority and right,* this view seems wholly at variance with their nature, antiquity, and typical character, as announced in the New Testament. The manner in which the offerings of Cain and Abel are introduced, (v. 3,) seems to intimate that such a method of propitiating the divine favor was then commonly practised; and that, in so very early a period of human existence, it should have re-

* In reference to these two views of the origin of sacrifice, see JENNING's Jewish Antiquities, and the authorities referred to, in Book I. Chap. V. Vol. I. p. 305 ss., Lond. edit. 1808.

sulted from observation of the influence of similar acts on men, or reasoning from the action to the wished-for end, is in the highest degree improbable. As the old dispensation was emblematic of the new, it seems altogether analogous to the general representations of scripture, to consider sacrifice as divinely instituted, in order to typify the offering of Christ. The Mosaic sacrifices were undoubtedly of this nature; and it is impossible to give a rational account of sacrifice, as almost coeval with the origin and co-extensive with the existence of man before the promulgation of Christianity, without allowing its divine original. The opinion, therefore, which has so often been maintained, that the beasts, whose skins contributed to form the clothing of our fallen parents, had been slain and offered in sacrifice by divine direction, seems to intimate the true origin of this remarkable rite. The case admits of but three possible suppositions. Either the animals referred to were put to death by our first parents, to supply their own wants of food or clothing; or they died a natural death; or they were slain as piacular victims. The first is in every view incredible, as is proved from the circumstances in which Adam and Eve stood. There is no improbability in either of the others. God may have exhibited to the culprits the agonies of death in the animal frame, in order to show them part of the consequence of their disobedience, and to make them comprehend with the more feeling, something of the terror of the sentence, "thou shalt surely die." Or, he may have intended by the exhibition to institute the sacrificial rite, as emblematic of "the lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world." The last view seems most in unison with the benevolence of him, who "*so loved the world as to give his only begotten son.*"

(28.) I have employed this language with a view to what

is perhaps the true meaning of v. 7. "If thou doest not well," if thou continuest to purpose and act wickedly; "sin lieth at the door," it is close at hand, involving guilt and punishment, and tempting thee to further acts of iniquity: 'unto thee is its desire,' it longs to subject thee to its meretricious influence, and courts thy favor; 'but thou shouldst rule over it.' Other meanings have, indeed, been elicited from the Hebrew, for which the reader must consult the commentators. Magee on the Atonement, No. LXV., gives various views, both ancient and modern. He explains the latter part of the verse of Abel's subjection to Cain, the elder brother: "thus he may become subject to thee, and thou mayest have the dominion over him." But this is not supported by the meaning of תִּשְׁקָה in the other two passages in which the word occurs, viz. Gen. iii. 16, and Cant. vii. 11, in both of which it is used of the female, and conveys the idea of inclination, desire. The same is the meaning of the corresponding Arabic word شاقى; and in Rabbinical Hebrew שִׁק is used in the same sense. The interpretation adopted by a certain Rabbi Solomon,* and given also by the best of the later Christian interpreters, is probably correct. לַפֶּתַח חַטָּאת רִבְיָא, הָעוֹן תָּמִיד צוּרָה לִקְחַת אֶת נַפְשְׁךָ וְשׁוֹקֵד עַל זֶה בְּלִי הַפֶּסֶק רָגַע לְהַחֲטִיאֲךָ: תִּשְׁקָתָהּ, לְשׁוֹן תַּאֲוָה וְחֶשֶׁק, ר"ל חַטָּאת תָּמִיד מִשְׁתַּוְּקֶקֶת לְהַחֲטִיאֲךָ, אֲבָל אֶתָּה אִם: "Sin lieth

* The work here referred to is a Commentary on the Book of Genesis, written in Rabbinical Hebrew by a learned Jew of Dubno in Russia, and printed in the first volume (4to.) of the דרך מלולה (raised up, that is, prepared way:) a work on the Pentateuch, and some other portions of the Old Testament used by the Jews in the Synagogue. It was published in Furth, in 1801. Besides the commentaries of this writer, and of some other Jews, it contains the Targum of Onkelos, the Commentary of Rabbi Solomon Jarchi, and a German Translation of the whole Pentateuch by the celebrated MOSES MENDELSSOHN, printed in Hebrew letters. This publication will be again referred to in these notes.

at the door. Iniquity is continually watching to take thy life, (or soul נפש) and without the intermission of a moment lies in wait to cause thee to sin.”—“תשוקתו denotes eager desire. The meaning is, that the sin (החטאת) continually desires to cause thee to sin. But, if thou wilt, thou canst conquer it, for the ability is given thee.”

Still it is proper to remark, that in the other passage in Genesis where the word occurs, it is followed by the same language as in the verse under consideration. In the one: “thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee;” in the other: “unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.” If, therefore, it be allowable to assume that תשיקוה had the general meaning of acquiescence, subserviency, thus implying simply inferiority in the one and authority and right in the other, it might well refer to Abel’s obligation to submit to the well known claims of his elder brother; and this indeed would give a very natural interpretation of the verse. The root of the word שיק, to run after, to desire, would certainly suit such a general meaning, although there is no direct proof that the derived noun was ever used in this sense.

The eighth verse is probably imperfect. According to the authority of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint, followed by the Syriac and Vulgate versions, the former part of the verse runs thus: ‘And Cain said unto Abel his brother, let us go out into the field.’ This agrees with the words which immediately follow, and I think is more probable than Dathe’s view, who gives to ריאתו the meaning of ‘spoke harshly to,’ from the Arabic; and also, than that of Gesenius, “and Cain said (it) unto Abel, that is, he told him that which God had said to him in v. 7.” Robinson’s Translation, under ריאתו 1.

29. The Hebrew of the thirteenth verse is ambiguous. It

may be rendered, 'my iniquity is too great to be forgiven,' (literally, 'to forgive' ;) or : 'my punishment is too great to bear.' The latter version agrees with what immediately follows ; the former gives a reason for what is said in the fifteenth verse.—The phrase in the fourteenth, "from thy face I shall be hid," may allude to some visible exhibition of divine majesty, from all connexion with which Cain was to be debarred ; but most likely it is figurative, in allusion to the usage of monarchs, (see note 9, p. 142, 143,) admission to whose presence (or face,) was always an indication of favor.—The last part of the verse intimates the remorse of Cain, and the horror which he supposed his fratricide would occasion in the mind of every one not lost to the ordinary feelings of nature.

"The Lord set a mark upon Cain." The absurdities to which this erroneous translation has given rise, may well be passed over. The inquisitive reader will find them in Patrick's note. The term **אֶרֶב** is generally used to denote an attestation or sign, intended to confirm the truth of some declaration, and it is often applied to designate a miraculous attestation. As there is nothing in the context which would determine the nature of this sign, it is impossible to arrive at certainty.—Instead of **לָכֵן**, *therefore*, at the beginning of the verse, some manuscripts read **כֵּן**, *not so* ; and this sense is given by the Septuagint, Symmachus, Theodotion, and by the Syriac and Vulgate versions. It is followed by Dathe : "nequaquam." The common reading is the more difficult, and, therefore, the more likely to be true. It admits of a clear sense, and, I think, it agrees with the use of *διὰ τούτο* in John vii. 22, and Rom. v. 12. The meaning seems to be, 'consequently,' consistently with what has been said, or is about to be said.

(30.) The land of Nod, that is, of wandering, or flight ; from **נָדָה**, "to be driven about, to wander."

(31.) The fragmentary character of these verses, which are also poetic in their structure, makes them necessarily obscure. The Jewish fiction appended to this imperfect account may be found in Patrick and other commentators. It is also given in full in the Rabbinical work, entitled ‘the Book of Jasher,’ a translation of which has lately been published in this city. The words in the latter part of v. 23 may be rendered interrogatively, and thus the innocence of Lamech will be contrasted with the guilt of Cain, and the groundlessness of the women’s uneasiness made evident. Or, they may be affirmative, implying that although Lamech had indeed slain a young man, it was in self-defence. The equivalent phrases, “to my wounding—to my hurt,”—may intimate, that the danger of being hurt and wounded by this youth’s attack, compelled him to the act. Or, according to another view adopted by Dathe and Rosenmüller, they may refer to contemplated aggression against Lamech on the part of the friends of the person whom he had killed: “to my wounding,” that is, so as to result in my being attacked and injured.

(32.) I have endeavored in the analysis to give a meaning which combines the two most ancient and satisfactory interpretations. The Targums and some other Jewish authorities suppose a direct reference to the rise of idolatry and the increase of wickedness, and translate the Hebrew word, “profaned”; a sense which it often bears in Piel. Some critics, comparing the words with such places as Isa. xlv. 5, xlviii. 1, translate thus: ‘then it was begun (or, men began) to call, (namely, one’s self, or to be called,) by the name of the Lord.’ Thus Dathe. As the invariable meaning of the phrase in the Old Testament is ‘to worship,’ the usage of language certainly requires the same sense here. See the excellent notes of Vossius on the first section of

Maimonides' Treatise on Idolatry, and those of Rosenmüller on this text.—But, as it is evident from incidental notices in the history, that the number of Adam's progeny must have been very considerable long before this time, it would seem altogether improbable, that the origin of divine worship, and even of public worship, should have been contemporaneous with the birth of Enos. This difficulty is avoided by supposing the sacred writer to use the expression in an emphatic sense, as referring to the public profession of true religion in opposition to idolatry and wickedness of every kind. The contents of the sixth chapter confirm this view.

PART III. CHAP. V. 1—VI. 9.

(33.) Adam is properly a generic term for *man*, but is here employed as a proper name, designating the first of his race. It may therefore be translated either 'Adam' or 'man,' as the case requires.

(34.) General view of the discrepancies of the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Septuagint chronology until the deluge; from JAHN'S Hebrew Bible, p. 12.

According to the Samaritan, Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech died in the same year; and therefore, probably, it is artificially constructed. See Bible de VENCE, Tom. I. p. 546, ss.

	Before Paternity.			After Paternity.			Total.		
	Heb.	Sam.	Sept.	Heb.	Sam.	Sept.	Heb.	Sam.	Sept.
Adam.	130	130	230	800	800	700	930	930	930
Seth.	105	105	205	807	807	707	912	912	912
Enos.	90	90	190	815	815	715	905	905	905
Cainan.	70	70	170	840	840	740	910	910	910
Mahalaleel.	65	65	165	830	830	730	895	895	895
Jared.	162	62	162	800	785	800	962	847	962
Enoch.	65	65	165	300	300	200	365	365	365
Methuselah.	187	67	187 167	782	653	782 802	969	720	969
Lamech.	182	53	188	595	600	565	777	653	753
Noah.	500	500	500						
Total.	1556	1207	2172						
Deluge.	1656	1307	2272						

It is observable, that the construction of the notice of Noah in v. 32, differs from that of all the preceding notices. These state the age of the individual spoken of, first, before paternity is mentioned; secondly, the time he afterwards lived; and, thirdly, the whole sum of his life. Here it is said: “and Noah was five hundred years old; and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth.” The difference is easily accounted for. The three sons of Noah are introduced, and not merely the first born, because they make so prominent a figure in the history which immediately follows. After giving an account of the flood, with the cause that gave rise to it, and some important matters closely connected with it, (vi. 1—ix. 27,) the author proceeds with the genealogy in

ix, 28, 29: "And Noah lived after the flood three hundred and fifty years. And all the days of Noah were nine hundred and fifty years, and he died." It is remarkable, that the same method of representation is pursued in xlvii. 28: "And Jacob lived in the land of Egypt seventeen years; so the whole age of Jacob was an hundred forty and seven years." In the former case, the period that Noah lived after the flood is first stated, with which the time that Jacob lived in Egypt corresponds. This is followed, in the one case, by a notice of "all the days of Noah," and, in the other, of "the whole age of Jacob."—The possibility of these two portions having been written by different authors, is, of course, undeniable, as one writer might readily imitate another; but, certainly, the commonly received opinion, that the whole book is the work of one individual, harmonizes exactly with the internal evidence hence resulting.

(35.) The phrase "walked with God," which is used of Enoch in v. 22, 24, denotes friendly and intimate intercourse, and consequently implies similarity of character. Comp. the Heb. in 1 Sam. xxv. 15, and Amos iii. 3. The Targum of Onkelos explains the general sense: 'walked in the fear of God.' To the same purpose the Septuagint ἐναγέσθησε, which is employed also in Heb. xi. 5, "he pleased God."—Perhaps, indeed, the Hebrew narrative would not alone justify a positive opinion in favor of Enoch's translation, but the passage in the epistle just referred to, is decisive with all who acknowledge its divine authority. Still the Hebrew alone would suggest something extraordinary. For while it is said of every other patriarch in this genealogical list, "and he died"; the language used respecting Enoch is very different: "he was not, for God took him." It is not therefore surprising that the oldest Jewish interpreters, the author of the Apocryphal Book of Wisdom, xlv.

16, and the Targumists, Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan, agree in the opinion that Enoch was translated to heaven. And, indeed, to suppose that the holy man's piety was rewarded with an early death, as must be allowed unless he were removed alive like Elijah, would be entirely inconsistent with the representations which pervade the Old Testament. "Length of days" and numerous offspring remunerate the devoted servant of God.

(36.) It is uncertain whether Noah's name were imposed immediately on his birth, or on some subsequent occasion. He is called נֹחַ *rest*, and yet his father says, this one יִנְחָמֵנוּ *will comfort us*. The Septuagint either read the text differently, or it explains the meaning: διαναπαύσει ἡμᾶς, shall give us rest; and several commentators would, by a slight alteration of the text, adapt it to this sense. They propose to read יִנְחִימֵנוּ. But all such expedients are unnecessary. יִנְחָמֵנוּ rather appears to be an allusion to נֹחַ, or a paronomasia with it, than intended to give an etymological reason of the name. Comp. Gen. xlix. 19, where we have בָּרַךְ בְּרָדִיד וְגִבְרָתוֹ, where the paronomasia is equally evident, although the association arising from the meaning of the words is very indistinct.

(37.) This appears to be the most satisfactory exposition of the text. That magistrates are intended by the phrase, "sons of God"; or that the higher ranks are said to have amalgamated with the lower, or (as very ancient interpreters, both Jewish and Christian, maintained,) that angels are represented as having had intercourse with women, whence giants are said to have sprung, the demigods and heroes of ancient mythology, are notions, which, however they may vary in degrees of extravagance, are alike unsupported by sober and rational investigation. It is surprising that Drechsler (*ubi sup.* p. 91, 92,) attempts to defend the last

mentioned sense of the phrase "sons of God." He supposes fallen angels to be meant, and, in proof of their being called by this appellation, appeals to Job i. 6, ii. 2. But here, and in xxxviii. 7, of the same book, holy angels are evidently designated. This is indisputable in the last passage. And in the other two, Satan is not said to be one of the sons of God; it is merely said that he presented himself among them. This would seem to be very unnecessarily introduced, if he belonged to their number; whereas, if he appeared in the light of an informer or accuser, intruding among beings with whom he had no right to associate, the notice of his presence in this holy company is altogether natural. The sons of God are probably those of the pious race, and the daughters of men, the ungodly, (idolators perhaps. Comp. iv. 26,) who appear to be so called by antithesis, as they are styled in the New Testament, children of the devil, or of this world. See 1 John iii. 10. Luke xvi. 8.

(38.) לֹא-יִדְוֹךְ. For the various interpretations of this phrase, see the commentators. All the most important views may be found in Dathe's note. Most of the ancient versions give the sense of 'shall not remain'; ἡ κατὰ μένη. Sept. non permanebit: Vulg. Probably they read יִלְוֶךְ or יִדְוֶךְ although Gesenius thinks this supposition unnecessary. See him on the word דִּוֶּךְ or דִּוֶּךְ. His own view is not very intelligible, either in the original Latin or the English translation. "In the first edition of the larger Lexicon," which contains, he says, "the view to which he has returned," his language is as follows: "My spirit, the divine which dwells in them, (the divine nature imparted to them,) shall not be debased, dishonored in man forever, since he is flesh; or, through his criminal conduct; flesh is he." See Handwörterbuch, Leipzig, 1810, Vol. I. p. 187. Ewald gives a similar interpretation. Komposition der Genesis, p. 203, 204, note. Their meaning appears to be, that the spirit should not al-

ways be subjected, as it were, to degradation and contempt by dwelling among such abandoned men. This interpretation of the word "spirit" was probably taken from the Dubnian Commentator in the *דֶּרֶךְ סְלֻלָה*: at least, it accords with that given by him. "My celestial (*הַעֲלִיּוֹנָה*) spirit which I breathed into man shall not continually contend and strive with flesh. *בְּשֹׁגֶם הוּא בָּשָׂר*: because he truly is flesh, and not divine spirit (literally, spirit of God, *רוּחַ עֲלִיּוֹן*), alone, but compounded of flesh and spirit."

Ewald (*ubi sup.*) remarks further, that if the expression, "his days shall be one hundred and twenty years," related to the term of respite allowed to the antediluvians, the fact that such a period was granted, would afterwards be stated, agreeably to the writer's usage. But we may well ask in this author's own language on another occasion, (p. 214,) "must the narrator cling so tenaciously to his form?" The execution of some threats he has indeed particularly specified, but not of all; and why should it be assumed that this must be of the number? The coming of the flood at the proper time would sufficiently mark the accomplishment of the threat to the party chiefly interested; and to others living after the flood, the fact itself as a divine judgment and warning was all important, not its chronological relation to the period of the threatening.

If *יָדִין* be equivalent to *יִדְּיוֹן* (and verbs *"עִי"* and *"עִר"* often interchange their middle radical,) the old translation of Symmachus & *καίρει* will give the sense, and this coincides with our own version, "shall not strive with," as one does, who is always judging, and censuring another's conduct. Or, agreeably to the Hebrew use of the word 'judge,' it may convey the idea of government, as if it were said, 'my Spirit shall not always rule (endeavor to rule) in man; after a limited period, I will abandon him to his guilt and its punishment.'

(39.) הַגִּבּוֹרִים or הַגִּבּוֹרִיִּים : both forms occur in Num. xiii. 33. These are the only two places in which the word is found. Our translation renders it "giants," in accordance with some of the ancient versions, particularly the Septuagint and Vulgate, which have *γίγαντες*, gigantes. Aquila has βίαιος, Symmachus ἐπιπίπτοντας, Onkelos אֲבִרֵי אֱמֶת powerful, the Syriac ܐܒܪܝܐ, the same. Other authorities give it the sense of revolvers, apostates. Any one of these meanings agrees with the radical idea of the word, and suits the context. The Dubnian Commentator on v. 2 thinks it implies inferiority, degeneracy, a falling off as we say, from their forefathers. He refers to Job xii. 3, לֹא-נִפְלְ אֲנֹכִי מִכֶּם, I am not inferior to you."

PART IV. CHAP. VI. 9—XI. 29.

(40.) אֶת-הָאָרֶץ, *with the earth*. So Onkelos אֶת; the Septuagint gives the meaning καὶ τὴν γῆν. Some prefer the sense of *from*, as if it were מֵהָאָרֶץ, but this is unnecessary. The threatened destruction of the earth by no means implies its being reduced to fragments, or the crushing to pieces (as some, especially those of the Hutchinsonian school, have maintained) of its exterior crust. General desolation and ruin of the surface, are what is meant. Whether the deluge extended over the whole earth, or was confined to those regions of Asia which are contiguous to the countries in which mankind originally settled, has been much disputed. The strong and unqualified representations contained in the account itself, (see particularly vii. 19 ss.) would seem to favor the affirmative. But, on the other hand, it may be said with truth that general statements are often limited by the very nature of the case, and the author may be supposed to speak of the world as then known. Certain it is, that language equally general in its meaning with that here employed in

reference to the flood, is elsewhere used in a very limited sense. Thus we read in Gen. xli. 54, 56, 57, that "the dearth was in all lands, and the famine was over all the face of the earth, and all countries came into Egypt to buy corn, because the famine was sore in all lands;" while it is evident, from the very nature of the case, that the application to Egypt for food must have been partial, and therefore, in all probability, so also was the distress. In the same sort of language, God tells the Israelites, that he "will begin to put the fear of them and the dread of them upon the nations that are under the whole heaven, who shall hear report of them and shall tremble," (Deut. ii. 25;) although it is not to be doubted, that he refers to the immediately surrounding nations, and those that might hear of the wonders performed in favor of the Hebrew people. In the same limited sense it is said in general terms, on occasion of the Pentecostal feast, that "there were dwelling at Jerusalem devout men, out of every nation under heaven," (Acts ii. 5;) and again, that "the gospel had been preached to every creature which is under heaven." (Col. i. 23.) It is needless to multiply instances of this usage. The universality of the flood cannot be proved solely from the unlimited nature of the language expressing it; although this language ought to be understood in its plainest sense, as asserting a general deluge, unless sufficient reason can be given for qualifying it by certain limitations.

It is said again, that the supposition of a general deluge corresponds with universal tradition, which "furnishes ample proof that this great event is indelibly graven upon the memory of the human race, and attested by the consent of mankind."

But, as it is correctly remarked by Dr. Smith, (*ubi sup.* p. 92,) "it is remarkable, that learned writers have not perceived the absence of any logical connexion between the

universality of historical tradition, and a geographical universality of the deluge itself. Immense pains have been taken, and very laudably, to collect the traditions of tribes and nations deposing to the fact of an overwhelming deluge in the days of their remotest ancestors; and it has been hence concluded, since those traditions existed in every quarter of the globe, that the deluge had belonged to every region. But it seems to have been forgotten, that each of those traditionary and historical notices referred to one and the same locality, the seat of the family of Noah, the cradle of the human race." Most undoubtedly the fact of an universal deluge, and the universally existing tradition of a deluge, are far from being identical. Those who have argued from the latter to the former, seem to have overlooked the important fact, that, as all men sprang from Noah, their traditions are to be traced to their origin, and that they would naturally bring these traditions to any region in which they might subsequently settle. Commentators have reasoned as if the traditions had originated in the various regions in which every diversity of the human species has been found.

Some of the most remarkable traditionary circumstances are mentioned in BOCHART'S *Phaleg*, Lib. I. cap. i., a work replete with curious and interesting learning, and in MAURICE'S *History of Hindostan*, Part III. chap. xiii. Vol. I. p. 453 ss. Many of them are stated by Professor HITCHCOCK, in his *Essay*, entitled "The Historical and Geological Deluges Compared," published in the *Biblical Repository*, No. XXV. January, 1837, p. 81—93. A vast deal of curious and interesting matter relating to the ancient traditions of the deluge, has been collected by BRYANT, in the third volume of his *Analysis of Mythology*. If we cannot always acquiesce in the soundness of the author's reasoning, we cannot but be surprised at the extent of his reading, and

must acknowledge that he has adduced very much from ancient authorities corroborative of the scriptural account. See also WISEMAN'S Lectures on the connexion between science and revealed religion, Lect. IX. p. 289 ss.

The universality of the deluge has also been supposed to be confirmed by numerous phenomena exhibited in various parts of the strata which form the exterior of the globe. It is unnecessary to state them in detail. Recent geological investigations and discoveries have induced many learned and scientific men, some of whom are also sincere believers in the inspiration of the Old Testament, to ascribe these phenomena to the natural influence of causes operating in periods of time antecedent to the present arrangement and formation of the earth. It is difficult to perceive how they could possibly have been produced by the ordinary operations of any deluge.

An argument has been drawn in favor of the deluge having been partial, from the supposed comparative paucity of mankind. This is thought to be supported by "the paucity of birth which not obscurely shows itself in the genealogical table, (Gen. v. 3—28,) the length of individual lives" being supposed "to compensate for the slowness of multiplication," and "moral depravity" having its natural "effect in diminishing the fecundity of the human species." Smith, p. 250. The correctness and applicability of this last observation need not be questioned. But when the author proceeds to confirm his reasoning by remarking "that no children of Noah are mentioned till he was five hundred years old, and that a century later, his three sons, each having a wife, had no children," meaning undoubtedly had never become parents, (p. 251 ;) he adopts a species of argumentation, which, although too commonly applied to the scriptures, is nevertheless unsound. He reasons from the absence of information respecting a subject to its want of existence.

Is it certain that Noah's three sons, each of whom was married, had had no children when their father was six hundred years old, because no children are mentioned? If such a method of reasoning were applied to the scriptural narrative of Cain and Abel, the facts related concerning them would be altogether inexplicable. The length of antediluvian life, after all proper allowance for its dissoluteness, during the period of time under consideration, would admit of the existence of a large population on the globe at the time of the flood.

In favor of the universality of the deluge, the reader is referred to a dissertation in the *Sainte Bible, en Latin et en François, avec des notes littérales, critiques et historiques, des préfaces et des dissertations*, drawn from the works of Calmet, De Vence and others, in 17 vols. 4to., Tome I. p. 414—438. The author replies to the objections of Vossius, who maintained the opinion, that the deluge was partial. In this opinion, Dathe also coincides; but he advances nothing new in support of it. See his note (*d*) on vii. 20.

(41.) Bochart has shown that, in all probability, the term **צֶפֶר** means cypress, which, indeed, seems to be radically the same word. See his *Phaleg*, Lib. I. cap. iv. p. 22, 23.—Schultens supposes **צֹהַר** to be equivalent to the Arabic **ظَهْر**, the back, and to be used for the roof of the ark, the elevation of which was to be no more than a cubit, allowing, he thinks, sufficient descent to carry off the rain. And this, he supposes, is what is meant by the Septuagint, **ἐπισυνάγων**, which he explains by *contracting*, “*colligens et contrahens, superne facies arcam.*” See his *Observationes ad Genesin*, Cap. I. It is quite as probable, however, that **ἐπισυνάγων** is used to denote the collecting of materials for the building.—Our translation “window” agrees with the Vulgate ‘*fenestram*,’ and the version of Symmachus **διαφανὲς**,

And it is probably correct, the singular being used collectively. The word properly means light, and seems to be employed by a metonymy for window. With the exception of this text, it is always found in the dual form. It is used to express midday, thus characterized by its bright, clear, light.

(42.) The distinction of clean and unclean animals most likely originated in the laws and usages connected with sacrifices, although it is certain that subsequently it obtained also in reference to meats which were considered as fit for food. In common with many other patriarchal institutions, it afterwards became a law of the Mosaic system, in which several of those institutions were incorporated. See the dissertation of H. S. REIMAR, entitled, *Cogitationes de legibus Mosaicis ante Mosen*, in the *Commentationes Theologicæ*, edited by VELTHUSEN, KUINOEL, and RUPERTI, Vol. VI. p. 1—74. It has been thought that the number of clean animals to be brought into the ark was fourteen, but it would be difficult to account for so large a number being required, and the Hebrews express the same number of different species or individuals by a reduplication. See especially, Num. iii. 47, in the Hebrew, and Mark vi. 7, 40, in Greek. If seven was regarded as a sacred number before the flood, as seems probable from the paradisaical origin of the Sabbath, and agrees with certain intimations contained in this narrative, (comp. vii. 4, viii. 10, 12;) this would account for the selection. And if all the clean animals lived, as is altogether probable, the number of each sort would be reduced to an even quantity, three of either sex, after Noah had made the offering mentioned in viii. 20.

A comparison of vi. 20, vii. 2, and vii. 8, 9, seems to show a discrepancy. But it is only apparent. In the first, two fowls of every sort are mentioned; in the second, seven

fowls, meaning, however, as the preceding verse intimates, those which were accounted clean. In the third, it is said : “of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of fowls, and of every thing that creepeth upon the earth, there went in two and two.” But this does not contradict what had just been stated. The language is not professedly critical, but rather popular. Either the phrase “two and two” is to be limited to the unclean animals who had been last mentioned, or the meaning is, that two at least of every sort, clean as well as unclean, were preserved. It would be absurd to suppose, that, in such a matter, a writer of merely ordinary intelligence could contradict himself within the space of a few lines.

(43.) The land of Ararat is the Hebrew expression in 2 Kings xix. 37, where our translators very correctly translate it “Armenia.” That the ark rested in this region, on the Gordicean mountains, has been most conclusively evinced, with a vast amount of learning, (more suo,) by Bochart, Phaleg, Lib. I. cap. iv.

(44.) The prohibition of “flesh with the life” or “the blood,” may have originated in motives of humanity, with the view of preventing the horrible practice of eating the flesh of living creatures. From the character of many of the antediluvians, it is not unreasonable to suppose that such abuses had been practised before the flood; and it is well known, that since that period uncivilized man has committed the same enormity. As the life was thought to subsist in the blood, (comp. Deut. xii. 23. So Josephus, Ant. Lib. I. cap. iii. § 8, *χωρὶς αἱματος ἐν σέσω γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ*. Hudson’s edition, p. 14,) the law may have been intended to interdict even the use of blood, in order to excite the greater abhorrence of the abuse just mentioned. It had also a religious bearing,

and was designed to impress on the public mind, the awful sanctity of that justice which required the blood of the victim to atone for the sinner's guilt. See Levit. xvii. 10—14.

(45.) It is not certain that this law is positive and peremptory. Like some others, afterwards introduced into the Hebrew code, it may be merely permissive, to be followed according to the discretion of the judiciary, governed by circumstances, as some Jewish commentators affirm to have been the case with respect to the law of retaliation of Ex. xxi. 24, 25. Levit. xxiv. 19, 20. But if it be a positive command, its universal obligation by no means follows. The circumstances and condition of mankind may so vary from the state in which they were when the law was originally promulged, as to make the continuance of the penalty highly inexpedient and improper. The grounds on which laws are mutable or unchangeably binding, is admirably settled by Hooker, in his third Book, § 10. His remarks are well worthy of attentive consideration. I cannot refrain from quoting the following sentence, from its remarkable applicability to the subject. "Laws, though both ordained of God himself, and the end for which they were ordained continuing, may notwithstanding cease, if, by alteration of persons or times, they be found insufficient to attain unto that end. In which respect, why may we not presume that God doth even call for such change or alteration as the very condition of things themselves doth make necessary?" Vol. I. p. 398, Oxford edition, 1793.

(46.) A clear and interesting view of this prophecy is given by Bishop Newton in his first dissertation on the prophecies. But there is not sufficient reason for reading 'Ham, the father of Canaan,' instead of "Canaan," as he proposes. As the prophecy has in view the descendants of the persons named and not the individuals themselves, and as it is by no means necessary to assume that all the descen-

dants of each individual are intended; if the servitude predicted was to exist chiefly among Ham's posterity through Canaan, it becomes a matter comparatively of indifference, which name is mentioned. It is not improbable, however, that Canaan may have concurred with his father in the indecent conduct which gave rise to the prophecy; and it is very probable, that his name was selected with the view of representing to the Hebrews the condition of Canaan's descendants, as exposed to the infliction of a divine punishment for their iniquities, a punishment which the conduct of their ancestor had been the occasion of predicting. A satisfactory exegetical examination of the latter part of this prophecy is given by Hengstenberg in his *Christology*, Vol. I. p. 42 ss. Keith's Translation. For the poetical construction of the passage, see Lowth's *Lectures on the sacred poetry of the Hebrews*, Lect. IV. p. 60 of GREGORY'S Translation, Boston, 1815.

PART V. CHAP. X. 1—XI. 9.

(47.) The fullest and most learned commentary on this tenth chapter is to be found in the last three books of Bochart's *Phaleg*. Other authorities, which may be consulted with advantage, are mentioned by Dathe and Rosenmüller. See also Maurice's *ancient history of Hindoostan*, Vol. I. p. 444 s.—It is evident that several of the names here occurring, are names of nations; in some cases they are patronymic also, in others merely gentilitious. Thus Gomer, Madai, Tiras, Mizraim, Canaan, Sidon, Elam, Ashur, and others, (v. 2, 6, 15, 22,) are names of individuals and of nations. Most critics consider the plurals in v. 13, 14, and elsewhere, as referring exclusively to cities or countries, or to their inhabitants. The meaning will be, that the Egyptians, expressed by the word Misraim, founded the nations or colonies denoted by the words Ludim, Anamim, &c.

Thus also in the sixteenth and following verses, the Jebusite, &c. does not appear to designate any particular individual, but is rather to be taken in a collective sense for the people respectively, as in 2 Sam. v. 6. "And the king and his men went to Jerusalem unto the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land," where the Hebrew is in the singular, אֶל-הַיְבוּסִי יוֹשֵׁב הָאָרֶץ, as it is also in v. 8.

Ver. 5. אֲרָצֵי הַגּוֹיִם, territories of the Gentiles; properly, maritime countries, coasts. The word is sometimes used for distant nations, countries lying on the sea, at the verge (as it were) of the world. In our English version it is always translated "islands," except in Jer. xlvii. 4, where it is rendered "countries." In Isa. xlii. 15, the supposition that "islands" are meant, is so improbable, as almost to involve an absurdity.

(48.) The historians referred to identify Nimrod with Zohak or Dhohak, whom they make the brother instead of the son of Cush. See D'HERBELOT's *Bibliothèque Orientale*, under Dhohak, p. 948, fol. Paris, 1697. If Nimrod's name be derived from מֶרֶד, to rebel, it was probably not imposed until his impious and overbearing conduct marked him out as the distinguished rebel against the divine authority. Perizonius conjectures that the term Nimrod, which is the first person plural of the future, may have arisen from his frequent and vain-glorious appeals to his impious companions, urging them to rebellion against divine authority, in which he would employ the word נִמְרֹד. See his *Origines Babylonicæ*, p. 122. It may indeed denote the temper of his mind, but it is not very likely that he gave this utterance to such a feeling. The phrase v. 9, "a mighty hunter before the Lord," is particularly emphatic. It may express, not only courage, strength, agility, adroitness, perseverance, and

such other properties as usually enter into the character of a good hunter ; but may intimate, that these qualifications were such as would bear the most thorough examination, they were possessed by him in the highest degree ; the Omniscient himself being the judge, he was a mighty hunter. Or else, more probably, it implies the boldness and impudence of the man, as it is said of the men of Sodom, that they "were sinners before the Lord exceedingly." Gen. xiii. 13. In either case, it will imply, that even the presence of Jehovah was no restraint on Nimrod. See Bochart, Lib. IV. cap. xii.

In very ancient periods of the world, when large districts of country were but partially settled, the scattered inhabitants were sometimes subjected to great annoyance from wild beasts, and consequently persons who exerted themselves in exterminating such animals, were regarded as benefactors of mankind. It is evident, that to prosecute such enterprises with most success, considerable parties of men would be necessary, conducted doubtless by some leader of distinguished talent and character. It is easy to infer that this leader might acquire popularity and attract multitudes to his standard, that he must direct the undertaking, and give the command, and thus his will would become the law of the rest. In the event of any difficulties or dissensions arising, he would of course become the umpire, and thereby his authority would be strengthened and enlarged. In the distribution of the skins or other spoil, his proportion would probably be the largest. As the owners of property, particularly of cattle, were especially interested in the successful issue of such hunts, it is most reasonable to suppose that they would encourage the enterprising captain by making him presents. He would therefore be in a condition to increase his popularity, by giving away what his own immediate wants did not require

him to keep. Thus his circle of dependants and friends would be extended; and perhaps what was first offered as a willing present, soon came to be demanded as a rightful tribute. It is easy to see how, in this way, the hunter of beasts, acquiring irresistible force and indomitable hardihood and courage in his conflicts with tigers and lions, might readily raise an army, and become the tyrannical oppressor of men, and the insolent contemner of God. And, in all probability, this is the history of the rise and power of Nimrod, the great ancient rebel.

(49.) For the authorities on which this interpretation of the names of the cities mentioned in v. 10 is given, the reader is referred to Rosenmüller's note.

(50.) Bochart (*ubi sup.* p. 229, 230,) contends, that אַשּׁוּר is the name of the country Assyria, and that the whole clause relates to Nimrod, and ought to be rendered thus: 'he went out of that land into Assyria,' that is, he invaded that region, took possession of it, and built Nineveh and the other cities. No doubt the original word often means Assyria, and the ה local is not necessary, although, to avoid ambiguity, its use would have been highly expedient. No doubt, too, the word יָצָא is frequently used for going out to war or battle; but this proves nothing, for it is very often used where no hostility can possibly be implied. Nor is there much force in what is further alleged by Bochart; that any notice of Ashur, a son of Shem, whose birth is mentioned in the twenty-second verse, is here out of place, as the immediate context is limited to an account of Ham's descendants. It is not uncommon with the sacred writers to introduce some circumstances of the history of particular persons, although their connexion with the main subject of the context is only incidental. We have an illustration of this in Gen. xxviii. 6—9, where Esau's marrying an addi-

tional wife is mentioned in the midst of a continuous narrative of Jacob's journey to Padan-Aram; and another in 1 Chron. v. 1, 2, where the cause of Reuben's being deprived of the birth-right, together with the favors bestowed on Joseph and Judah, are merely appendages to the prominent topic. If now the character of Nimrod were such as scripture and eastern history allow us to suppose, it is easy to see why a man of character and independence, feeling himself unable to cope with an oppressive despot, should leave his country, and settle where he might exert his talents and influence without control. I conclude, therefore, that the common translation, which coincides with most of the ancient versions, is to be preferred.

ROLLIN, in his *ancient History*, Vol. II. p. 181, London, 1795, follows BOCHART, and of course makes Nimrod the founder of the old Assyrian monarchy. Hales also, in his *New Analysis of Chronology*, adopts the same view. See Vol. I. p. 447, and Vol. II. p. 50. On the other hand, BRYANT, in his very learned and curious, though often fanciful, *Analysis of Ancient Mythology*, defends the common translation. Vol. VI. p. 192 ss. 3rd edit. Lond. 1807. So also SCHUCKFORD, in his *Sacred and Profane History Connected*, Vol. I. p. 161 ss. Lond. 1819.—According to the former view, the ancient Babylonian monarchy was the commencement of the kingdom of Nimrod, who, having conquered Assyria, built Nineveh, calling it after his son and successor Ninus, who probably enlarged and finished it. According to the latter, the ancient Assyrian empire was founded by Ashur, and was distinct from the ancient Babylonian, until Ninus, successor to Ashur, subdued the Babylonian and other neighboring people, merging them in the Assyrian empire.

(51, in the *Analysis* erroneously printed 50.) בְּנֵי-עֵבֶר (v. 21, is translated by some critics, following Rashi, 'children

of the other side,' meaning the other side of the Euphrates; and thus Eber will be represented as the ancestor of those people, (that is, of the larger proportion of them,) who lived on the east of that river. But the ellipsis of a word to express the river is harsh and unnatural. Parkhurst translates it, "children of passage or pilgrimage," and thinks it refers to their "itinerant" character, "passing from one place to another, until their settlement in Canaan, and confessing themselves pilgrims upon earth." See his Hebrew Lexicon under עֶבֶר I., or Greek Lex. in Ἑβραῖος. He follows Julius Bate, in his *Critica Hebræa*, or Hebrew-English Dictionary. The principal reason for either of these versions is found in an objection urged against that usually received, namely, that Shem "was no more the father of the children of his great-grand-son Eber, than of his other descendants." But this objection is removed by explaining the phrase, "children" (or sons) "of Eber," as equivalent to 'Hebrews,' whose ancestor is here said to be Shem, the subject of a divine benediction. See ix. 26.

Our English translation makes Japheth "the elder" of the two brothers; but the probability is, that the clause ought to be rendered, "the elder brother of Japheth." Dathe, who at first adopted the former opinion, afterwards acknowledges himself mistaken, and defends the latter. So also Rosenmüller. Both refer to an able essay relating to this subject by JOHN F. SCHELLING, in the *Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur*, Vol. XVII. p. 1—25. There seems to be no sufficient reason for departing from the usual construction, which places the eldest son first. Patrick remarks that the article prefixed to אֵלֶּיךָ elder, "plainly directs us to refer the word to him who was last spoken of, namely, Japheth." By what usage of the Hebrew language, this plain direction is supported, it were difficult to say. Judg. i. 13, and ix. 5, are evident instances of the contrary, for in

both cases **הַקָּטָן** plainly refers to the former noun, and Professor Bush, who cites these two places, is undoubtedly right in saying that "had a uniform mode of rendering been pursued, the words before us would no doubt have been translated, 'Shem, the elder brother of Japheth.' " Still, he considers the word **הַגָּדוֹל** as pointing not to seniority of age, but to priority in honor;" because "the evidence of Japheth's being the eldest of the three sons of Noah is too strong to be set aside." The only evidence alleged by him is what I am about to state from Patrick, which, indeed, is somewhat plausible, and is considered by that distinguished commentator as a "plain proof" that Japheth was the eldest son of his father. On comparing v. 32, vii. 11, and xi. 10, it is argued, that Noah was five hundred years old when the eldest of his three sons was born, and that he was five hundred and two on the birth of Shem, because he was six hundred when he entered into the ark, two years after which Shem was one hundred, who must consequently have been two years younger than his brother Japheth. But, how little dependence is to be placed on this argument will be evident to any one, who considers that the scripture very frequently uses round numbers, omitting fractional parts. And such appears to be the usage in v. 32, as it is in the highest degree improbable that Noah became the father of three sons in the same year.

In the genealogical list contained in the fifth chapter, one son only of each patriarch is introduced. The three sons of Noah are doubtless mentioned, because of the important position which they occupy in the subsequent narrative.

The repetition of circumstances already mentioned, however contrary to good usage among occidental authors, is very common not only with the Hebrew writers, but also with the Arabian. See Drechsler, *ubi sup.* p. 98, 99, and Ewald's *Komposition der Genesis*, p. 122 ss. 170, 171. This

remark will account for the frequency of such notices as v. 32, vi. 10, vii. 13, ix. 18. Comp. also xi. 10—18, with x. 22, 24, 25, vi. 6, with 7, and this with 11, 12, 13. To introduce a theory of various original documents, in the hope of explaining such phenomena, would be preposterous.

(52.) As the country in which the immediate descendants of Noah lived, could not have been remote from the place in which the ark rested, the wanderers referred to must have come from the north, in order to arrive at the plains of Babylonia. The opinion of Shuckford, Vol. I. p. 88 ss., that the ark had floated over to the confines of China, that Noah is identical with Fohi, and that this party had come literally from the extreme east, is encumbered by difficulties, not the least of which is the impracticability of traversing so extensive a region of country at so early a period after the flood. Bochart (*Lib. i. cap. vii. p. 31.*) conjectures that the sacred writer follows the usage of the Assyrians, and applies the term 'east' to all the region lying beyond the Tigris, without particular reference to its geographical position. That on the opposite side of the river would of course be named the west. This supposition is now generally adopted by interpreters, and it frees the text from embarrassment.

(53.) Le Clerc conjectures that the true reading in v. 4, is 𐤇𐤍 instead of 𐤇𐤍, and that it expresses the idea of a metropolis. But any alteration of the text is unnecessary and without authority. Some have supposed 𐤇𐤍 to mean a conspicuous sign, raised with a view to guide shepherds. Dathe adopts this view. To the ordinary interpretation he objects, that reputation with posterity would not prevent the dispersion of these people. But the text does not limit the wished-for renown to posterity; and the distinguished character and fame which they hoped to establish by building

the city and tower, might reasonably be expected to attract others to their community, and to strengthen the bonds of mutual union.—It has been said, that the very great elevation of the tower was designed for astronomical observations; but this is mere conjecture, hardly consistent with the state of the people referred to, and the very early period of their existence. Besides a mountainous region would seem better adapted to such a purpose than a plain.

(54.) The first verse literally translated runs thus: ‘and the whole earth was lip one and words one.’ The former term lip, שֵׁפָה, is sometimes used by a metonymy for *language*, as in Isa. xix. 18: “In that day shall five cities in the land of Canaan speak the *language* of Canaan. שֵׁפַת כְּנָעַן”; and xxxiii. 19: “a people of deeper *speech*, שֵׁפָה, than thou canst perceive,” meaning probably, a foreign, unknown dialect.—But it is also employed in the sense of speech, *discourse*, in reference to its *nature and character*, without regard to its linguistic peculiarities; as in Prov. xiv. 7: “Go from the presence of a foolish man, when thou perceivest not in him the *lips* of knowledge, שֵׁפַת־דָּעַת,” that is, ‘wise and sensible discourse.’ Kindred words, such as *mouth and tongue*, are also used in this latter sense. In 1 Kings xxii. 13, and 2 Chron. xviii. 12, we find the very similar phrase ‘one mouth,’ פֶּה אֶחָד, denoting unanimity, “with one accord,” as the same Hebrew expression is well rendered in our version of Josh. ix. 2, in accordance with the Septuagint ἅμα πάντες, and the Vulgate, uno animo: “They gathered themselves together to fight with Joshua and with Israel, with *one accord*, פֶּה אֶחָד.” And in Zeph. iii. 9, the very word ‘lip,’ שֵׁפָה, is used in connexion with expressions of unanimity. “For then will I turn to the people a pure *language*, שֵׁפַת בְּרִיָּה, that they may all call upon the name of the

Lord, to serve him *with one consent*. So also in Ps. lv. 10, “divide their *tongues*,” שִׁוְיָם, is equivalent to, ‘spread confusion among them and ruin their counsels.’ The same figurative use of such words is common in all languages. Hence Virgil says, unoque omnes eadem ore fremebant. *Æn.* xi. 132.—Vitringa, in his dissertation on the confusion of languages, which may be found in his *Observationes Sacræ*, (Lib. I. cap. i—ix. p. 1—124, particularly cap. ix. p. 109 ss.) supposes, that the whole of this verse merely expresses the idea of unity of mind respecting the intended object, and by the confusion afterwards related, he understands the dissensions which arose and led to the dispersion. It would seem that the bare fact of confounding the one original language, thereby introducing several distinct dialects, would not be necessarily attended by an abandonment of the scheme and the dispersion of its projectors. The surprise and consternation which would be occasioned, might gradually yield, as the alarmed builders ascertained that some of their number could still hold intercourse with others; and thus the work might advance, though slowly and not without its peculiar difficulties. The possibility of this, however, by no means encourages a belief that such would be the result. Without vastly more of philosophy than falls to the lot of bodies of men in any age, a confusion of language would be likely to lead to a want of harmony, quite incompatible with a successful termination of such an enterprise as that under consideration. And that the text does assert a confusion of language and not merely of design, (however true it may be that this did take place as a consequence of the other,) is plain from the general character of the expressions in the first and ninth verses, where the unity and confusion spoken of are represented as co-extensive with the whole habitable earth. The context affords no ground whatever for limiting their application. To which

may be added the remark of Perizonius quoted by Rosenmüller, that, inasmuch as the sacred writer had in the previous chapter frequently mentioned the distribution of Noah's posterity, according to their families, countries, and languages, intending now to explain the occasion of such a distribution, he premises the very natural observation, that before this event mankind all used one common tongue.

How many languages were formed in consequence of the confusion here related, it is impossible to say. The Jewish notion of seventy, and that of seventy-two maintained by many of the Greek and Latin fathers, are alike unsupported by any solid argument. The reader will find all that is necessary to know on this subject in Bochart's *Phaleg*, Lib. I. cap. xv., de confusione linguarum.

The dispersion of these builders in consequence of the confusion of the one original tongue, would necessarily lead to a still wider diversity of languages, which is the ordinary result of diversity of climate, condition, and association. But to ascribe all varieties of human speech to these and other natural causes, is inconsistent with the plain declaration of the inspired narrative, which not only asserts a confusion of language, but declares it to have been effected on this particular occasion, and in the particular place here specified. The seventh and ninth verses clearly prove this point. The former expresses the divine determination to produce the confusion "*there*," and the latter informs us, that "the Lord did *there*" accomplish it. The dispersion is evidently the result of this confusion, not this confusion the result of the dispersion simply.

Before concluding this note, I cannot help noting the contemptuous and indecent manner in which Berger, in the work before referred to, speaks of this narrative. Although he considers the whole idea of a confusion of language as a chimerical notion, philosophically speaking an impossibility,

he feels no difficulty in allowing that such a confusion is here asserted to have taken place. "The old world had no hesitation in extending their representations of the power of God beyond the bounds of absolute possibility. If it were required to recall the past day, to make a real transaction not to have been done, or to exhibit a four-cornered circle, they would not have scrupled to ascribe this to the divinity;" Vol. I. p. 114. Like many other representations of this writer, this statement and the application which he makes of it are characterized by a flippancy which might well enough become an infidel sneerer, but is very little consistent with the gravity of a philosophical inquirer, to say nothing of the seriousness required of one who professes to write an Introduction, pointing out the moral and practical bearing of the Old Testament. What shall be said of the candor or discrimination of an author, who represents Abraham as founding a system, injurious to the intellectual cultivation of his posterity, and making their conversion to Christianity extremely difficult! p. 139.

(55.) The derivation of Babel (whence Babylon,) from בָּבֶל to confound, is plainly asserted in the ninth verse. There appears to be an elision of a ב, בָּבֶל being put for בָּבֶל, like גִּלְגּוּלְתָּהּ for גִּלְגּוּלְתָּהּ, like גִּלְגּוּלְתָּהּ for גִּלְגּוּלְתָּהּ. See Bochart, Lib. I. cap. xv. ad fin. p. 61. Gesenius compares the form of the word with טַבַּח for טַבַּח. —Eusebius, in his Evangelical Preparation, has preserved fragments relating to the city and tower, collected from the works of Abydenus and Eupolemus. See Lib. IX. cap. xiv. xvii. p. 416, 418, edit. Colon. 1688. They are inserted by Rosenmüller at the end of his note on v. 9, and, along with other authorities, by Bochart, cap. xiii.

PART VI. CHAP. XI. 10—26.

(56.) General view of the discrepancies of the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Septuagint chronology, and also that of Josephus, until the birth of Abraham, from JAHN's Hebrew Bible, p. 25.

	Before Paternity.				After Paternity.			Total.
	Heb.	Sam.	Sept.	Jos.	Heb.	Sam.	Sept.	
Shem.	100	100	100	112	500	500	500	600
Arphaxad.	35	135	135	135	403	303	400 430	433
Cainan.			130				330	
Salah.	30	130	130	130	403	303	330	433
Eber.	34	134	134	134	430	270	270 370	464
Phaleg.	30	130	130	130	209	109	209	
Reu.	32	132	132	130	207	107	207	
Serug.	30	130	130	132	200	100	200	
Nahor.	29	79	179 79	120	119	69	125 129	
Terah.	70	70	170	70				

Between the names of Arphaxad and Salah, the Septuagint introduces that of Cainan. But this is no doubt an interpolation. It is unsupported by any other ancient version, and is not found in the Hebrew text. The internal evidence is also against it, for the age of this supposititious Cainan is the same with that of Salah, both before and after their paternity

is mentioned; each is one hundred and thirty years before, and each lives three hundred and thirty after, which is an exceedingly improbable coincidence. That St. Luke mentions Cainan in iii. 36, only shows that his genealogical list followed the Septuagint. See PLANCK's Introduction to Sacred Philology and Interpretation, translated from the original German, and enlarged with notes, by the author of this work, Note, XLI. p. 278, 279. Bochart, however, denies this, and takes some pains to sustain the conjecture of CORNELIUS A LAPIDE, that the Septuagint was altered in order to accommodate it to the copies of the Gospel, into which he thinks the error had first crept. See his learned examination of the subject, Lib. II. cap. xiii. p. 89—91. The admission of this principle would involve the critic in difficulties arising out of other similar discrepancies.

PART VII. CHAP. XI. 27—XXV. 11.

(57.) In v. 31, the English translation is, "and they went forth with them." This is the true sense of the Hebrew. There is no necessity, with Dathe, to follow the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Syriac, Septuagint, and Vulgate versions, all of which read in the singular, 'he went out with them,' or, 'he brought them out.' The Chaldee Targum agrees with the Hebrew text. The meaning may be, that Terah and Abraham went with Lot and Sarah, agreeably to the opinion of Rashi, which is approved by Rosenmüller. Or, it may intimate that other inhabitants of Ur accompanied the party here named. May it not be true that Nahor went with his brother Abram? The narrative does not indeed expressly mention such removal, and yet we find that Abraham's servant, who is sent to Mesopotamia to procure a wife for Isaac, goes "to the city of Nahor," (xxiv. 10,) the residence of Rebecca, (v. 15,) and of course of her brother Laban.

But Laban's dwelling-place was Haran, as is evident from xxvii. 43, xxviii. 10, xxix. 4. I conclude, therefore, that this branch of the patriarchal family had removed from Ur to Haran; and I am not aware of any scriptural statement which forbids the supposition, that the removal was contemporaneous with that of Abraham.

(58.) According to the Hebrew text, Terah lived two hundred and five years, and this reading is supported by all the ancient versions. But the Samaritan text reads one hundred and forty-five. And this seems to be preferable: for, by comparing Gen. xi. 26, with xii. 4, it appears, that if Abraham were the eldest son, he left Haran one hundred and forty-five years after his father's birth. If Terah lived two hundred and five years, he must have survived this removal sixty years. In this case we must suppose him to have been left in Haran, as the text tells us he died there. But such a supposition is wholly incredible, and is expressly contradicted by St. Stephen in Acts vii. 4, who states, that Abraham's removal was subsequently to his father's decease; and it is evident that it must have taken place shortly after that event. If we adopt the Samaritan reading, all is clear and probable. It is defended by Bochart, Vol. I. p. 863, 864, who conjectures, that the error in the Hebrew may have arisen from the similarity of the letters פ (100), and מ (40), particularly as, in some manuscripts, the lower part of the former is cut off. If there be an error, it must have arisen at a very early period. This preference of the Samaritan text would indeed be unnecessary, if we could admit, with Dr. ADAM CLARKE, that Abram was the youngest son, born in his father's one hundred and fortieth year. But this position is untenable, as it was the ordinary practice to mention the eldest son first. See note (51.) Besides, from xvii. 17, it appears that Abraham regarded it as a very extraordinary circumstance, that a person who had arrived

at the age of one hundred should become a parent, which is altogether irreconcilable with the opinion that his father was one hundred and forty at the time of his birth. A comparison of Rom. iv. 19, and Heb. xi. 11, 12, will confirm this argument.

(59.) The English version of the phrase וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה "now the Lord had said," is remarkable. It is usually rendered, 'and the Lord said.' The translators were probably led to prefer the pluperfect tense, from the impression that this is the same call as that mentioned in Acts vii. 2, 3, where the language agrees. This is the view of Rosenmüller, who considers the previous notice of Terah's death as proleptical. But the connexion of the narrative makes it plain, that the command here given relates to the departure from Haran. The first verse contains this command; in the second and third the promise is made; the fourth and fifth mention the departure itself, a departure from Haran, and in compliance with the divine direction. That St. Stephen has employed the same language to express the original call from Ur of the Chaldees, only proves its applicability to either. If it be objected, that the terms, "from thy kindred and from thy father's house," would be inapplicable after his father's death, it is easy to reply, that they are at least as much so after as before, on the supposition of his father's accompanying him. Rosenmüller, indeed, objects to Le Clerc, who understands Haran by the expression "thy country," that with the Hebrews the land of any one means his native country, which in this case was of course Chaldeea. No doubt it ordinarily does, as it does also in all languages. But any place in which a person resides for a considerable time, is said to be his country, as in Matt. ix. 1, Capernaum is called our Lord's own city. Comp. iv. 13. Thus too Virgil, *Æneid* III. 297, speaks of Andromache's

having married a husband of her country in the Trojan prince Helenus, although Troy was only her residence, her native place being Thebes. Other examples might easily be adduced. The terms employed in the passage under consideration seem intended to express the complete dissolution of all connexion with the land in which Abram dwelt, entire abandonment of all his local associations, with the view of forming others wholly different. It is highly probable, that the original command of God to Abram so particularly mentioned by St. Stephen, was repeated to him in Haran very soon after the dissolution of his father.

(60.) This promise is several times repeated. See xviii. 18, xxii. 18, xxvi. 4, and xxviii. 14. In the first and last instances, as also in the text, the Niphal conjugation is used ; in the other two the Hithpacl. The result however is the same, the former being taken in its ordinary passive sense, and the latter retaining its usual reflexive meaning : ‘ shall consider themselves blessed, shall congratulate themselves.’ The gloss of Rashi, which Le Clerc has adopted, is this : ‘ by thee all nations shall bless.’ But, as Rosenmüller remarks, this would require the Hithpacl, as in Deut. xxix. 18, (19.) “ הִתְבָּרַךְ, *he shall bless himself* in his heart.” Besides, it is irreconcilable with the phraseology “ through thy seed,” which is used in three of the five instances. This is explanatory of the other phrase “ through thee.” Both relate to Abram’s spiritual progeny, and principally to his most distinguished descendant, Christ. See the application of this promise, Gal. iii. 8, 9, 14, 16, 29, Acts iii. 25, 26. On this prophecy, compare Hengstenberg, *ubi sup.* p. 46 ss.

(61.) The remark at the end of the seventh verse : “ and the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land,” has been supposed to be an interpolation. But evi-

dently without any ground. Its external authority is not disputed, and the internal evidence in its favor is strong. No remark could have been more apposite, as the vicinity of these people, who could not have been friendly to the new comers, must have made intestine divisions particularly dangerous. Besides, it intimates to the reader, that the level pasture grounds being already considerably occupied by the Perizzites (comp. Gesenius under the words פְּרִזִּי and פְּרִזִּי, and Hengstenberg's *Authentic des Pentateuches*, II. p. 186,) the remaining portions were insufficient for two such companies as those of Lot and Abraham. Here it may be well to remark, that the same statement, which the sacred author has also made in xii. 6, is undoubtedly genuine; for as the last mentioned writer has observed, p. 185, it is in close connexion with the promise contained in the seventh verse, and illustrates the patriarch's faith, who believed that God would give that land to his posterity, although the Canaanite was then its occupant.

The last clause of the tenth verse, "as thou comest unto Zoar," is connected with the former part, the words, "before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt," being parenthetical. This construction has been overlooked by the Syriac translator, who has taken it in immediate connexion with "the land of Egypt," and read Zoan. All the other ancient versions agree with the Hebrew. The comparison with "the garden of Eden," occurs also in Joel ii. 3.

Some writers have advanced the opinion, that, before the destruction of Sodom and its sister cities, and the consequent formation of the Dead Sea, the river Jordan pursued a southerly course along the desert, and found its way into the eastern branch of the Red Sea. BURCKHARDT, who travelled this route to Egypt, gives a description of the ground, which coincides

exactly with such a supposition. The reader will doubtless wish to see the statement of this distinguished traveller.

“The valley of the Ghor, which has a rapid slope southward, from the lake of Tiberias to the Dead Sea, appears to continue descending from the southern extremity of the latter as far as the Red Sea, for the mountains on the east of it appear to increase in height the farther we proceed southward, while the upper plain apparently continues upon the same level. This plain terminates to the south near Akaba, on the Syrian Hadj [pilgrim] route, by a steep rocky descent, at the bottom of which begins the desert of Nedjed, covered, for the greater part, with flints. The same descent, or cliff, continues westward towards Akaba on the Egyptian Hadj road, when it joins the Djebel Hesma, (a prolongation of Shera,) about eight hours to the north of the Red Sea.”

“The Wady Gharendal empties itself into the valley El Araba, in whose sands its waters are lost. This valley is a continuation of the Ghor, which may be said to extend from the Red Sea to the sources of the Jordan. The valley of that river widens about Jericho, and its inclosing hills are united to a chain of mountains which open and enclose the Dead Sea. At the southern extremity of the sea, they again approach, and leave between them a valley similar to the northern Ghor in shape, but which the want of water makes a desert, while the Jordan and its numerous tributary streams render the other a fertile plain.—The general direction of the southern Ghor is parallel to the road which I took in coming from Khanzyre to Wady Mousa. At the point where we crossed it near Gharendal, its direction was from N. N. E. to S. S. W. From Gharendal it extends southward for fifteen or twenty hours, till it joins the sandy plain which separates the mountains of Hesma from the eastern branch of the Red Sea. It continues to bear the appellation of El

Ghor as far as the latitude of Beszeyra, to the south of which place, as the Arabs informed me, it is interrupted for a short space by rocky ground and wadys, and takes the name of Araba, which it retains till its termination near the Red Sea." *Travels in Syria and the Holy Land*, by the late JOHN LEWIS BURCKHARDT. London, 4to. 1822, p. 435, and 441, 442.

Professor Robinson, however, whose views on geographical points connected with Palestine and Arabia are entitled to the very highest respect, both on account of his general accuracy and thoroughness of investigation, and of his having examined the country himself, in company with a Reverend friend and missionary, declares this opinion to be untenable. His views may be seen in part in a letter addressed to the editor of the *Biblical Repository*, which appeared in the number for January, 1840, p. 24 ss. It is presumed that his work on the *Geography of Palestine*, the publication of which may soon be expected, will contain further disclosures on this subject.

(62.) Hebron is said to have been in the plain, or rather, among the oaks, (עֵץ מַמְרֵי,) of Mamre, the Amorite. See xiv. 13.

It would appear from Judges i. 10, that before the age of the author of that book, the name of Hebron was Kirjath-arba. Hence it has been argued, that the word in Genesis is either an interpolation, or that some editor, posterior to the time of the author, substituted it in place of the original word, which in his day had become obsolete. But on the other hand, Hebron may have been the original name of the place, and Kirjath-arba a subsequent appellation, which, after the conquest of Canaan, gave place to the former. It would seem from Gen. xxiii. 2, that when Moses wrote this part of the Pentateuch, both names were occasionally used: "Sarah died in Kirjath-Arba, the same is Hebron in the land of

Canaan." It must not be assumed from this place, that Kirjath-Arba was the more ancient appellation. As Arba was a distinguished man among the Anakim, (Josh. xiv. 15,) a gigantic race of people very distinguished in the time of Moses and Joshua, but not mentioned in the patriarchal history, it is probable that Hebron, a very ancient city, (Num. xiii. 22,) was rebuilt or fortified or embellished by this person, and hence became designated by his name, the city (קִרְיָתָא) of Arba. That a city may for a short time partially lose its most ancient name, and afterwards regain it, is illustrated in the case of Jerusalem, which for a time was called *Ælia Capitolina*, but afterwards assumed its ancient appellation. The same remark may apply to what is said in Judg. xviii. 29, respecting a place called Dan. See Gen. xiv. 14. This may have been its original name, although for a time it was called Laish or Leshem, the first designation being re-applied in memory of the son of Jacob. Some writers, however, are of the opinion, that there were two places of the name of Dan lying in the northern part of Palestine, and Hengstenberg supposes the Dan of 2 Sam. xxiv. 6, to be the one of them, to which the addition of *Jaan* is appended, in order to distinguish it from the *Dan-Laish* of the book of Judges. *Authentic des Pent.* II. p. 194.

(63.) Elam is certainly a part of Persia, if it does not comprehend the whole. From the prominence given in the narrative to the king of this country, (see particularly v. 4, 5, 17,) it has been inferred, that the Elamites, identical probably with the Persians, were the most powerful nation of Western Asia, since even Canaanitish kings were tributary to them. Shinar is the word for Babylonia. What country is meant by Ellasar is uncertain. See Gesenius, who thinks that "the Assyro-Babylonian name of its king,

Arioch, seems to indicate some province of Persia or Assyria. Comp. Dan. ii. 14."—The word גִּרְיָם, which is rendered "nations," comprehends probably the country lying north-east of Gallilee. Comp. Isa. viii. 23, (ix. 1,) "Gallilee of the nations."

(64.) It is said in v. 7, that "they smote all the country of the Amalekites," and, inasmuch as Amalek was a grandson of Esau, xxxvi. 12, the introduction of the Amalekites in the history of Abraham has been thought to involve a palpable contradiction.

Most commentators, following the authority of Josephus, (Ant. Lib. II. cap. 1. § 2,) take it for granted, that the Amalekites were descended from the Amalek just mentioned, and account for the introduction of the name here by supposing a prolepsis. Hengstenberg, *ubi sup.* II. p. 303 ss., has defended this view. Some very distinguished writers, however, among whom may be reckoned Calmet, Le Clerc, Michaelis, and Bryant,* maintain that the Amalekites were a very ancient nation, flourishing long before the age of Esau's grandson, and of course wholly independent of him. It may be proper to state the principal arguments on both sides of this question.

1. On the one side it is said, that the place of residence of the Amalekites is "Mount Seir," the country which was occupied by the descendants of Esau. Thus we read in 1 Chron. iv. 42, 43, that "some of the sons of Simeon went to Mount Seir, and smote the Amalekites." The country of the Amalekites, therefore, belonged to Idumea. Such a coincidence is most readily accounted for on the supposition that the Amalekites were a part of the Edomites.

Undoubtedly this would be the readiest solution, if it in-

* Analysis of Mythology, vi. 212 ss.

volved no difficulty. But it is by no means a necessary solution; as it is quite conceivable, that the ancient Amalekites may have settled in that mountainous region, while the Edomites subsequently took possession of such portions as remained unoccupied. Incidental circumstances, which history has not transmitted to us, may have given rise to a local connexion between the Edomites and the ancient Amalekites.

2. Again, it is said to be quite improbable, that a people standing in so important a relation to the Israelites, should be without any genealogical notice. This is foreign from the ordinary usage of the book of Genesis. And it is still more improbable, that no intimation should be given in the whole work of two distinct and separate races of Amalekites.

The latter remark assumes the contested point, for the language of Gen. xiv. 7, may itself be an intimation of an Amalekitish race anterior to the time of Esau; not to say, that other places in the Pentateuch hereafter to be examined may strengthen such an opinion. Besides, the descendants of Amalek, the grandson of Esau, may have been merged among the Edomites in general, just as the posterity of Jacob's twelve sons are usually designated by the name of Israelites; unless, indeed, they became incorporated with the more ancient Amalekites, in consequence of some association or affinity which history has not preserved. The conclusion drawn from the general usage of the book of Genesis is unauthorized. Where is the genealogical notice of the Chaldees and Perizzites? In relation to the former, nothing can be inferred from the name Chesed in Gen. xxii. 22, and the origin of the latter is, I believe, unnoticed. We cannot argue from the frequent to the invariable usage of an author.

3. Some force has been attached to the phraseology in Gen. xiv. 7, "the *country* of the Amalekites," not the people themselves. Hence it has been supposed that the author in-

tended to designate the region which in his own time was occupied by the descendants of Esau's grandson. It would not follow that Amalekites resided there in the age of Abraham, in reference to whom the name will have been used by way of anticipation.

The possibility of this is hardly to be denied. But I think it is exceedingly improbable. All the other names in this part of the history seem to be those which were in use in Abraham's time, and there ought to be strong reasons for excepting the term under consideration from the general usage. Neither is it very likely that a writer so learned and intelligent as the author of the book of Genesis, would designate a tract of country in this way, although he might proleptically introduce the name of a city or village. Is it to be supposed, that a historian of Great Britain would represent an inroad made on the Saxons of England, as an attack on a country of the Normans? The statement of this analogous case places the difficulty of the supposition in its true light.

The other view of the subject is thus defended.

1. The identity of names proves nothing. The grandson of Esau may have had the name of Amalek given him either from some incidental cause, or on account of the distinguished character of the more ancient personage who had made it celebrated.

2. In Num. xxiv. 30, Amalek is called "the first of the nations," which certainly implies at the very least great antiquity. But this, says Hengstenberg, is a misapprehension of the true meaning of the words. They must be limited by the context, which refers to the hostile attitude assumed against Israel. In this sense the Amalekites took precedence, as they were the first of the neighboring tribes to attack the Hebrews on their march towards Canaan. See Ex. xvii. 8—16. This sense of the place is supported by the Chaldee

Targum, which paraphrases it thus: "first of the wars against Israel, **רִישׁ קְרָבֵיּא דְּיִשְׂרָאֵל**," that is, first of those nations who made war upon the Israelites. It appears more reasonable, however, to consider the words as expressive, not of an insulated fact in their history, but of some well known property or characteristic of the nation, its great antiquity, comprehending also well established strength. This is in harmony with what is said in the following verse, which describes the impregnable security in which the strongly fortified Kenites boasted. The limitation put upon the words is indefensible, such an addition to their simple sense being wholly unnecessary.

2. It is further argued, that the opposite conduct which the Hebrews were directed to pursue towards the Edomites, who were descendants of Esau, and towards the Amalekites, proves them to have been distinct races. The former were to be treated as brethren; with the latter they were to wage interminable war. See Num. xx. 14—21, Deut. ii. 4, 5, xxiii. 7; with which texts compare Ex. xvii. 8—16, Deut. xxv. 17—19, and 1 Sam. xv. 2 ss. In reply to this, Hengstenberg remarks, that good reason can be given for the different conduct of the Israelites towards the Amalekites and the other Edomites. "These, although not friendly to the Israelites, had done nothing against them to dissolve a fraternal connexion as the Amalekites had." But this is evidently inconsistent with the representation in Num. xx. 18, 20, 21, where Edom replies to his "brother Israel's" request to be permitted merely to "pass through" the country, "thou shalt not pass by me, lest I come out against thee with the sword;" and further still with the fact, that the Edomites did actually "come out against the Israelites with much people and with a strong hand," and "refused to give Israel passage through his border."

3. The traditionary account of the Arabians is also ap-

pealed to in defence of this view. Their historians represent Amalek as the son of Ham, the father of Ad and grandfather of Shedad. See Calmet's Dictionary, and D'Herbelot's *Bibliothèque Orientale* under Amlak.

On the whole, the evidence appears to preponderate in favor of the opinion, that the Amalekites were a powerful nation existing long before the age of Esau.

(65.) If as many as three hundred and eighteen men capable of bearing arms were born in Abram's house, it is evident that his domestic establishment could not have consisted of less than one thousand five hundred or two thousand souls. He was therefore a powerful chief; and thus he is represented in several places in Genesis. See xii. 5, xiii. 2, 6, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 10, 35, 53.

(66.) There is no contradiction between v. 17 and 10. The opinion of Aben Esra, that the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah threw themselves into some of the pits for the purpose of concealment, is unnecessary; neither is it supported by the ordinary sense of the word בְּבֵרֵי. The most probable meaning is, that they and their men fled to this valley, where some were destroyed, and others escaped to the mountain region. The king of Sodom was fortunately among the latter number.

(67.) All historical knowledge respecting Melchisedek that can be relied on is contained in this very brief account. Nothing more is known of him except that he was king of a place called Salem,* which was probably situated on the

* Some have identified this place with Jerusalem, but without any satisfactory proof. Jerusalem is indeed called Salem, (Ps. lxxvi. 2,) by a contraction probably; but the historical circumstances here mentioned, render it most probable that Salem was considerably north of

west of the Jordan between the lake of Gennesaret and the Dead Sea, and that he was a priest of Jehovah; thus uniting in his person, agreeably to ancient usage, the royal and sacerdotal characters. The peculiarity of the "order" or rank of his priesthood, and the analogy which it bore to the priestly office of Christ, are points of Christian doctrine, but not connected with the history of Abram. See Ps. cx. 4, and Heb. vii.

The dignity of this distinguished personage is well argued in the chapter last referred to. But the opinion advanced by some of the old Romanists, and lately also by Dr. Hale, *ubi sup.* Vol. I. p. 128, that the "bread and wine" which he is here said to have brought to Abram, v. 18, were emblematic of the eucharistic elements, is utterly unfounded. The natural result of such extravagant representations is to lessen the reader's respect for scripture and for the judgment of the author. Every one knows that the term 'bread' is used by the Hebrews for food in general, and wine was useful to restore the exhausted energies of Abram's party. A refutation of this unfounded notion, against the alleged arguments of Natalis Alexander, may be found in Buddæus, *ubi sup.* p. 268—270.

(68.) Whether עָשָׂה, v. 2, refers to his course of life, as if he had said, 'I am passing my time,' or his advanced age, and the probability of his passing away from the present scene, is doubtful. The Septuagint often translates it by words expressive of dying. Here it uses ἀπολόμαί, in Ps. xxxix. 13, (14,) ἀπὸ λῦσιν, and in lviii. 8, (9,) ἀνταναιεζεῖσθονται.—

Jerusalem. Certainty on such a point is unattainable. The passage in 2 Sam. xviii. 18, "Absalom had reared up a pillar, which is in the king's dale," throws no light on the geographical situation of the place; because the locality of "the king's dale" cannot be determined. To assume that it lay near Jerusalem, is to beg the point in question.

Most of the old versions and commentators explain בן-מִשְׁקָן as a Hebraism for "steward;" either from שָׂקַק or טָקַק to run about, expressive of activity, diligence, supervision, or from the Arabic مَسَقَمَ, to comb, trim, polish, keep in order, according to the office of a superintendent. A few consider מִשְׁקָן as a proper name. It is evidently a paronomasia with what follows דְּמִשְׁקָן, and may be used, as Gesenius thinks, for מִשְׁקָן possession, which is probably its meaning in Job xxviii. 18. The phrase will thus be a Hebraism for 'possessor,' and convey the idea expressed in the Analysis. For a full view of the ancient authorities on this passage, the reader may consult Rosenmüller's note.

(69.) It is not probable that Abram's faith, from which his justification resulted, is mentioned here as a part of the vision; although it is barely possible, and might be so represented, as an intimation of the fixed habit of his mind; as in the case of Solomon's asking for wisdom in a dream. See 1 Kings iii. 5 ss. If the account of what took place in the vision extended, as Rosenmüller thinks, to the ninth verse inclusive, the sixth should be regarded as parenthetical. The fifth is easily explained; as the Lord may be said to have brought Abram out and showed him the stars, although no corporeal action took place, but all was represented to the mind. The language of MAIMONIDES* illustrates this remark. כְּמוֹ שִׁירָאָה אָדָם בַּחֲלוֹם שֶׁכֶּבֶר הַלֵּךְ לָאָרֶץ הַפְּלוֹנִית וְנִשָּׂא שֵׁם אִשָּׁה וְעַמֵּד זֶמֶן וְנוֹלֵד לוֹ בֶּן וְקִרְאוֹ פְּלוֹנִי וְהָיָה מֵעַנְיָנוּ מָה שֶׁהָיָה כֵּן מִשְׁלֵי הַנְּבוּאָה הָאֵלּוּ אֲשֶׁר יִרְאוּ אוֹ יַעֲשֶׂה בַּמִּרְאָה הַנְּבוּאָה וְגו' * * * * אַחֵר שְׂנוּדֵעַ שֶׁהַכֹּל הָיָה בַּמִּרְאָה הַנְּבוּאָה לֹא הוּצָרָךְ לְהַשִּׁיב

* More Nevochim, Part II. chap. 46, fol. 70, Berlin edition, 1795, and in Buxtorf's translation, p. 322.

בזכור כל חלק וחלק מן המשל שיהיה במראה הנבואה' כמו שיאמר הנביא ויאמר ה' אלו ולא יצטרך לבאר : שיהיה בחלום : "As in a dream," says this learned and judicious Rabbi, "a man may seem to himself to go to a certain country, to marry a wife, and spend a considerable time there, to have a son by her called by some particular name, and of whom this and that may be said ; so is it also in prophetic vision. Actions and things which the prophet is said to do, space of time intervening between different actions, removal from one place to another ; all these are done in prophetic vision, and are not to be considered as real and sensible actions, however minutely they may be specified. To state that any particular part of a communication was made in prophetic vision, would have been unnecessary, because it was well known that the whole took place in that way." It is indeed possible, that the first communication may end with the fourth verse, and another be comprehended in 7—9, and again a third begin with v. 12. But this is, to say the least, unnecessary ; and it is not probable, as the second communication would be introduced abruptly, without any notice of the manner, while the first is mentioned as taking place "in a vision," and the last is made after "a deep sleep and horror had fallen on Abram." The mental agony which he suffered, may have been occasioned in part by agitating reflections on his situation and prospects ; but, in all probability, it was caused in a much greater degree by natural inability to bear divine communications without being deeply and distressingly affected. Comp. Dan. viii. 27. x. 16 ss.

(70.) In Gen. xv. 13, it is said : "they shall come out with great substance." The particularity of the prediction is remarkable. Compare the language of Ex. iii. 21, 22 : "I will give this people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, and it shall come to pass, that, when ye go, ye shall not go

empty. But every woman shall borrow (ask) of her neighbor, and of her that sojourneth in her house, jewels of silver and jewels of gold and raiment; and ye shall spoil the Egyptians." Add xi. 2, 3, and xii. 35, 36.

(71.) The emblems of affliction and almighty protection passing between the pieces indicates a covenant on the part of God with Abram, comprising the promise of deliverance from the predicted calamity. By this symbolical rite, covenants were anciently ratified. Why this emblematic reference of the furnace and lamp to the predicted servitude and deliverance, should be regarded as out of place in consequence of a covenant being thus indicated, (as Rosenmüller suggests,) I am unable to see.

(72.) Vossius, in his work on idolatry, Lib. II. cap. 74, p. 690—691, explains the phrase, "river of Egypt," of the Nile; not understanding, however its main stream, but a branch running from the Pelusiæ channel towards Palestine, and falling into the Mediterranean, or (as he calls it,) the Egyptian or Phœnician sea, near the southern boundary of that country: "*rivum ex brachio Pelusiaco Judæam versus procurrentem, indeque profluentem in mare Ægyptium, sive Phœnicium.*" But the opposition between the river of Egypt and the Euphrates, shows that the main stream itself is meant. The prominence of this river accounts for its being selected to mark out the extreme limit of the promised land on the one side, as the well known Euphrates does on the other. That the Hebrews never possessed the portion of Egypt which lies east of the Nile is no serious difficulty. Nice geographical accuracy is not intended. Comp. Ex. xxiii. 31. The substitution of Egypt in the Analysis for the river of Egypt is in accordance with 2 Chron. ix. 26: "he reigned from the river even unto the land of the Philistines,

and to the border of Egypt." Between this country and that occupied by the Hebrews, nothing intervened but a small portion of unimportant desert.

(73.) See SALE'S Preliminary Discourse, prefixed to his translation of the Koran, Sect. I. p. 11. London edition, 1836. Also Discourses on Prophecy, by JOHN DAVISON, B. D. third edition, Oxford, 1834, p. 490—493. As the remarks of this writer are particularly worthy of attention, it may be well to lay them before the reader.

"The publication [announcement] of this prophecy (respecting Ishmael) is *ascribed* to the time of Abraham; it is said to have been given before the birth of Ishmael, who was to be the progenitor and founder of this future nation; of which nation we must in reason understand what is here foretold: "he shall be a wild man, and his hand shall be against every man, and every man's hand against him;" since such a state of general hostility could hardly attach to an individual, except as the representative of his progeny or nation. But, since the date of this remote prophecy rests upon the word of Moses in the Pentateuch, we cannot assume that this particular, respecting its time of publication, is true; and though the faith and veracity of the sacred historian have been often effectually vindicated, that is a previous or collateral topic, from which our present examination shall borrow nothing. Suppose then that the public knowledge of the prophecy was only contemporary with the Pentateuch itself. The Pentateuch, containing the public code and solemn annals of the Jewish people, could not be put forth surreptitiously, nor in any other age than that which it bears upon the face of it; the age of Moses its author. At that time, if not before, the prophecy was extant.

At that time, then, we shall have a prediction delineating, under a brief, but expressive description, the genius and

manners of a people who have always been reckoned a very singular race, and that description, in all its brevity, marking the very habits of life by which this race has been distinguished from the rest of the world. "He will be a wild man; and his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him. And he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren." If we call for the report of the historians and travellers of every age, they will inform us that we have here the very character of the Arabian. They will tell us of his roving habits; of the desultory career of his rude freedom, which has neither been subdued by conquest, nor reclaimed by the milder restraints of settlement and civilization. They will tell us also of the license of his predatory warfare and the state of defiance and hostility which forms the international law between him and those around him. There appears therefore, in this instance, to have been an exact and remarkable accomplishment of this aboriginal prophecy concerning the Arabian race.

Will it be said, however, that so soon as in the time of Moses, to which, for the sake of argument, I have consented to refer the publication of the prophecy, the Ishmaelite then was what he since has always been, and that the subsisting picture of his national manners was converted into the semblance of a prediction? History is too imperfect for us to sift the allegation. If we admit the prophecy to have been a real one, we may easily believe that the people who were the subject of it soon began to verify it. But since, apart from the prophecy, we know nothing of them in this respect, let us consider what is probable. Now I think it will be granted that the imperfect settlement of the world, and the general rude state of nations at that time, render it highly improbable that any such deep appropriate marks could have begun to distinguish the Arabian, as would arrest the attention of a common historian, and enable him to

select and seize so truly, the *one example* of those peculiar national habits which was ultimately to survive and exceed the rest. There were too many wild men then, to make one instance of it in a race a rare one. Too much of promiscuous rapine and violence, to give a single people the privilege of a reputation on such accounts.

But one certainty we have, that is, the long continued fulfilment of this prophecy. The Arabians have occupied one and the same country. They have roved, like the moving sands of their deserts; but their race has been rooted whilst the individual has wandered. That race has neither been dissipated by conquest, nor lost by migration, nor confounded with the blood of other countries. They have continued to dwell "in the presence of all their brethren," a distinct national family, wearing, upon the whole, the same features and aspect which prophecy first impressed upon them. The wildness which is incident only to a certain stage of man's social nature, has been permanent with them; and, although they have been compacted and embodied as a nation for more than three thousand years, they have resisted those changes of habit which it is the effect of civil union, so long continued, to induce. Plainly, there is something unusual and remarkable in their case. And yet the account which could now be given of them, with all the advantage of knowing their whole past history, is no other than was given of them long ago, in the first rudiments of their national existence, if we take the prophecy at the lowest supposable date of it, and before they existed at all, if we rely upon the only direct testimony which we possess, and that an unimpeached one, as to the real time of its publication."

(74.) The phrase עַל-פָּנָי, rendered in our version, "in the presence of," means 'on the east of.' In describing

places, the Hebrews face the east. Hence, עַל-פָּנָיו, literally 'on the face of,' refers to the region which is towards the face, in other words, the east. And so it is used in other places. See xxiii. 17, 19. עַל-פָּנָיו מִמַּמְרֵא 'east of Mamre,' xxv. 9, and especially 18. In this last passage, עַל-פָּנָיו כָּל-אֶחָיו נָפְלוּ, the English translation is: "and he died in the presence of all his brethren." But, not to urge the extraordinary sense which this implies, (Ishmael's dying in the presence of the other children of his father,) it is contrary to usage. נָפַל, which properly means 'to fall,' is not employed in the sense of dying, except in reference to violent death, when its use is agreeable to analogy. The translation ought to be, 'it fell on the east of his brethren;' and the clause is evidently elliptical, meaning, 'the lot fell,' that is, 'their country lay on the east of Palestine.' So the Septuagint, καταρχησε. In Josh. xiii. 6, חָצַלְתָּהּ is correctly rendered in our translation, "divide thou it by lot;" literally, 'cause it to fall.' The death of Ishmael is mentioned in v. 17, and is succeeded by a geographical description of the region in which his posterity lived. Thus the Arabians are called 'sons of the east,' and the Arabian magi are said to come from the east. See JUSTIN MARTYR'S Dialogue with Trypho, Part II. GRABE'S edition, p. 304. Geographical terms are frequently employed in scripture with some degree of latitude. The descendants of Ishmael were settled partly east and partly south-east of the Hebrews, the latter direction being comprehended under the more general term.

Since writing the above, I have met with the work of the Rev. CHARLES FOSTER, B. D., entitled "Mahometanism Unveiled," London, 1829, 2 vols. 8vo. It is extraordinary that so sensible a writer should have founded an important part of his theory on an interpretation which is, at least, of doubtful authority. He considers the expression, 'in

the presence of, as implying contiguity of situation, and "a posture of hostility," "hostile contact and collision." The character of hostility is indeed explicitly stated in the former part of the twelfth verse; but it is by no means implied in the words under consideration, which simply refer to geographical situation. This learned author, however, not satisfied with an interpretation, which makes the "Ishmaelish Arabs stretch themselves along the entire frontier of Canaan, from the Euphrates to the Red Sea," thinks that he finds in this simple geographical designation a prophecy to this effect, that the descendants of Ishmael should not only "exercise an implacable and unremitting hostility against the offspring of Isaac, their brethren, in immediate contact with whom they were at first planted by the hand of Providence," but that this "prophetic conflict" was in subsequent ages to be "renewed," when the Jews and Mohammedans should meet in the remotest countries of the world. Vol. I. p. 93, 94, 135. It is unnecessary to show, that such views derive no support from the language of the text. But it may not be unworthy of remark, as an illustration of the vagueness of exposition not founded on philological examination, that the celebrated Sir Harry Vane, Junior, when referring to a law of exclusion passed by the early puritans of Massachusetts, against which he objected as an act of intolerance, quotes this very language as expressive of peaceful and harmonious intercourse! "Scribes and Pharisees, and such as are confirmed in any way of error, are not to be denied cohabitation, but are to be pitied and reformed. *Ishmael shall dwell in the presence of his brethren.*" See BANCROFT'S History of the United States, Vol. I. p. 390, fifth edition.

(75.) The English translation of the middle clause of the

thirteenth verse, "thou God seest me," follows the Septuagint and Vulgate, *ὁ θεὸς ὁ βλέπων με* qui vidisti me. This version supposes the word רָאָה to be a participle from רָאָה with ׀ as a pronominal suffix. The regular form of the participle with the suffix of the first person is רָאֵנִי, or accented רָאֲנִי, as it occurs in Isa. xlvii. 10, אֵיךְ רָאֲנִי 'there is none that seeth me.' Still there are examples of the use of רָאָה as a participle with the pronominal suffix. Thus in Job vii. 8, עֵינַי רָאָה "the eye of him that hath seen me;" and Ps. xxii. 8, (7.) כָּל-רָאֵי "all they that see me." Also xxxi. 12, (11.) רָאֵי "they that did see me." It is better, however, to consider the word as a noun, of the form of קָנִי affliction, and to render the whole phrase thus: 'thou (art) the God of sight,' that is, who allowest thyself to be seen. I observe, after writing this, that the same view of this word is given by Rabbi Solomon of Dubno, in the דרך בלולה דרך "קני, קנמי, קנרי, an abstract noun of the form of קנ, meaning, thou art the God of seeing (אל ראות אלה), who appearest to the sons of men." The reason of Hagar's applying this name appears from what follows: 'for she said, do I indeed here see,' that is, enjoy the use of my senses and live, 'after my sight,' after having seen the symbol of the divine presence! It is an expression of grateful surprise at being permitted to continue in life and health, after the enjoyment of a privilege, to which it was the general opinion that no one could be admitted and live. Comp. Exod. xx. 19, Deut. xviii. 16, Jud. vi. 22, 23. The word רָאִיתִי is evidently chosen as a paronomasia with קָנִי.—The name given to the spring is of the same import: Beer-lahai-roi, meaning, 'the well of the living, (an epithet usually applied to God,) of sight,' that is, of him who allows himself to be seen.

(76.) Abram, compounded of אֲבִי father and חַם high, is expressive of dignity. By a very slight change in the latter part of the word, it becomes Abraham, meaning, as the context explains, father of a great multitude. The word which forms the latter part of the name no longer exists in the Hebrew : but it is found in the Arabic *أَهَامٌ*, a great number. That the name was intended to intimate his spiritual relationship of paternity to all the faithful, as well as to denote the immense number of his lineal descendants, we have the express testimony of St. Paul. See Rom. iv. 11, 12, 16, 17, Gal. iii. 7—9, 14, 16, 29.

(77.) On the authority of Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, and Strabo, supported by other evidence, it has been contended that circumcision originated with the Egyptians, from whom it spread to other nations. Among the defenders of this view, one of the most distinguished is SPENCER, who gives the arguments on both sides with fulness and learning, in his work *De Legibus Hebræorum*, Lib. I. cap. iv. sect. 4. Le Clerc, also, in his note on v. 10, suggests that the Egyptian practice may have given occasion to the divine command to Abraham. VON DER HARDT, as quoted by Buddæus, *ubi sup.* Period I. sect. iii. cap. 4, note ***, p. 277, endeavors to remove the difficulty, by supposing a partial, private, and medicinal use of the rite to have existed antecedently to the time of Abraham, but not allowing its general use among the Egyptians. But such an occasional practice is altogether hypothetical. Rosenmüller in *loc. cit.* cites JABLONSKI, saying, that as circumcision, both among the Egyptians and the descendants of Abraham, was a religious rite, emblematic of purity, it was not regarded as obligatory by the former except on the priests and other ecclesiastical persons. If this very limited application of the rite were more ancient

than Abraham's time, God may have extended the obligation of it to every male, in order to intimate that his people ought all to be holy, like priests. But the passages quoted from the Greek authors above mentioned, say nothing about a limited use of this ceremony. The scriptural evidence favors the opinion, that the narrative in the text contains the history of the origin of circumcision. In defence of this view, see Buddæus, *ubi sup.* p. 275—282. Jer. ix. 25, 26, to which Spencer appeals in order to show that the Egyptians were a circumcised people, is certainly better adapted to prove the contrary. The expression, "all these nations are uncircumcised," being in immediate connexion with the words, "all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart," is a reason for taking it in the literal and most comprehensive sense. See Rosenmüller on this place, who allows, that as a nation the Egyptians were uncircumcised, and the Idumæans also until the time of John Hyrcanus. Respecting the practice of the Ammonites and Moabites we have no evidence, p. 302, 303.—The declaration of God in Jos. v. 9, "I have rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you," is also appealed to by Spencer, who supposes it to imply, that before the time of Joshua, uncircumcision was regarded by the Egyptians as disgraceful. But it is clear that the language proves nothing on this point. For the phrase, "the reproach of Egypt," may as well be explained of contempt usually thrown by the Israelites on their Egyptian oppressors; who would be selected as the objects of this opprobrium, on account of the hatred which their tyrannical conduct would naturally excite. But, probably, the text intimates the state of freedom and dignity to which the Hebrews are now considered as advanced, on renewing their covenant with Jehovah by means of the instituted rite, and immediately on their entrance into the promised land. "The reproach of Egypt" will thus comprehend the former dis-

graceful slavery, the evils, and, indeed, the very memory of which may be said to be removed by becoming the Lord's privileged freemen.

(78.) The excision referred to is explained by some of excommunication, by others of banishment. But the opinion generally maintained by the Jews, that it relates to some punishment inflicted by divine interposition, is best supported. See Levit. xvii. 10, xx. 2, 5, 6, xxiii. 30. That divine Providence *always* interfered to punish the culprit is, by no means, a necessary consequence.

(79.) The various feelings which must have agitated Abraham's mind, now of delight, arising out of the exercise of full faith, and again of apprehension, springing from even the slightest degree of doubt, and prompting the prayer for the son already born, may be illustrated by a comparison with the representation made in the Gospels of the alternating emotions of fear, doubt, and joy, with which the Apostles received the evidence of their master's resurrection. See Luke xxiv. 34—37, and especially v. 41; from which it appears, that, after they had themselves informed the disciples who had just arrived from Emmaus, "that the Lord had risen," and thus confirmed the account of his appearance on the road, immediately on his showing himself they are affrighted, and suppose him to be "a spirit," and even on further evidence "believe not for joy." Homer expresses the same natural feeling, when he represents the Trojans as hardly able to believe that their darling Hector has escaped in safety after his engagement with Ajax:

Καὶ ὅ γ' ἤγον προπὶ ἄστυ, ἀέλωντες σόον εἶναι·

Iliad, vii. 310.

The note of Madame DACIER, cited with approbation by

CLARKE, conveys the true sentiment: *Præ lætitia vix credentes verum id esse quod viderent.*

(80.) The language of our English version, both in v. 10 and 14, “according to the time of life,” is not very intelligible. The Hebrew is לְשָׁנָה בְּחַיֵּיהֶּנּוּ, and it occurs also in 2 Kings iv. 16, 17. Our translators explain לְשָׁנָה as a noun. It seems better, with the greater proportion of good critics, to consider it as an adjective, the feminine of חַי living. Thus it may apply to Sarah herself, and imply that she shall live. But it is much clearer and more beautiful, to regard it as poetic; literally, ‘according to,’ (or when) ‘the time’ (or season, or year.) ‘is living,’ reviving again, returning. Thus it will denote, as Gesenius thinks, “the reviving year, that is, the coming spring, when the winter shall be past and nature revives;” or else, ‘this same season next year,’ as if he had said, ‘when this time (of the year) lives again.’ See xvii. 21, from which it is probable that this divine manifestation to Abraham took place not long after his submission to the rite of circumcision.

(81.) The punctuation of the word אֲדָנִי in v. 3, with the same vowels as those which are applied to יְהוָה, and the masoretical intimation of sanctity expressed by the word קֹדֶשׁ in the margin, seem to justify the conclusion, that the Rabbins identified the person whom Abraham addresses with him, to whom the word יְהוָה is applied in v. 13, 14, 17, &c.* And probably they were correct in so doing, as it seems difficult to make the whole narrative consistent on any other supposition. At first Abraham sees three men, to

* Compare also the Rabbinical punctuation of אֲדָנִי in Judg. vi. 15, and see Vitringa's Dissertation, *De Angelo Sacerdote*, in his *Observationes Sacræ*, Lib. IV. cap. xiv. § xviii—xx. p. 1099—1102.

one of whom, the most distinguished perhaps in personal appearance, he directs his discourse. The promise is evidently announced by this same personage, (v. 10.) as none other can be understood without introducing an additional speaker, of whom the text gives no intimation. That the reproof and repetition of the promise contained in v. 13—15, which are ascribed to “the Lord,” יְהוָה, were conveyed by some other agent than the person just referred to, or one of the two angels that accompany him, must be granted to be possible. But I think every reader will perceive that such a supposition is wholly destitute of probability. Pursuing the narrative, we find that Abraham’s guests bend their course towards Sodom, attended by their host; that before he “returns” home (v. 32,) “the Lord” communicates to him his purpose of destruction, and Abraham pleads for the guilty cities. The language of the sixteenth verse is resumed in the twenty-second, the intermediate being parenthetical. It is said, “and the men rose up from thence and looked towards Sodom;” and again, “and the men turned their faces from thence and went toward Sodom.” It is most natural to suppose, that the “three” mentioned in the second verse are intended; and yet it is equally natural to infer from what immediately follows, v. 17 ss., that the person who makes the communication ascribed to “the Lord,” and to whom Abraham appears to address his supplication, is one of the same party. From the latter part of the twenty-second verse, “the men—went toward Sodom, *but Abraham stood yet before the Lord.*” and from the narrative in the next chapter, from which it appears that only “two” of the angels proceed to Sodom in order to accomplish the divine purpose, this inference is strengthened. The conclusion would, therefore, seem to be, that the most prominent of the three personages introduced in the narrative, is he whom Abraham principally addresses; that, if he accom-

panied the other two beyond the precincts of Abraham's residence, he did not afterwards rejoin them; and that these two are identical with the angels who deliver Lot and destroy Sodom.

Still, however, if this be granted, the supposition that Abraham employed the title אֲדֹנָי in the third verse, in the sense of אֱלֹהִים is inadmissible; for doubtless he addressed the stranger with the ordinary title of civility and respect, as Lot did the two angels, and as the woman of Samaria did our Lord, before she knew anything respecting him, except that he was a Jew fatigued by travelling. See John iv. 11. The supposition itself is no doubt of very high antiquity, as it certainly appears in the Chaldee Targum, which uses the abbreviation for Jehovah, אֱלֹהִים. The use of the singular in the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Syriac versions, proves nothing; as it may be employed in reference to the most prominent of the three. Our own translation "my Lord," agrees with this opinion. Still, if the received punctuation be followed, אֲדֹנָיִם may be the plural with the suffix, the vowel being lengthened on account of the accent.

The Jewish interpreters having laid it down as a principle, that no more than one commission is delegated to one angel at a time, account for the mission of three by saying, that one was sent to predict the birth of a son to Abraham, another to save Lot, and the third to destroy the devoted cities. Hence they attempt to explain some of the peculiarities of this narrative. For instance, the plural number is employed in the first nine verses, (except the third, for which a reason has already been given,) while the promise of the birth of a son, (v. 10,) is made in the singular. So in xix. 17—22, where one of the angels speaks, and is addressed by Lot. But this is rather plausible than solid. For in the latter reference, both singular and plural are

used in intimate connexion in v. 17 : “ and it came to pass, when *they* had brought them forth abroad, that *he* said.” And from what precedes, it is plain that this distinction of offices is assumed without proof. The promise of a son is indeed in the singular, but the inquiry for Sarah, which introduces it, is in the plural : (xviii. 9, 10.) Thus, too, in xix. 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, Lot’s security is ascribed indifferently to both the angels. And so also in reference to the destruction of the cities in v. 13. Such language as that in v. 21, 22, is easily explicable. One among a multitude of agents might employ it ; much more one of two. The natural and simple supposition, that Lot or Abraham addresses the agent who is apparently the most prominent, or even the most accessible, satisfactorily explains the alternate use of either number.

The narrative under consideration, according to the view above taken of it, suggests an inquiry of no little interest both in its nature and results. If it be one of the three seeming men whom Abraham addresses by the title “ the Lord,” יְהוָה, does it follow that the person so addressed is really the uncreated ?—is it God himself who appears under the image of a man ?—or, is the divine agent, whom Jehovah sends to effect his purposes, regarded as his substitute, inasmuch as he acts by his authority ; and does he consequently appear invested with his dignity, assuming his name and character ? To settle this question by a full examination of Scripture and ancient Jewish authority, would be quite incompatible with the brevity of these notes. No doubt, as Drusus remarks, it is the general practice in these accounts, to ascribe to God what the angels whom he commissions are said to do ; and the Lord is often said to speak and act when he employs the instrumentality of an angel. The principle on which such phraseology occurs, is stated in the axiom, *qui facit per alium facit per se*. In the nar-

rative the instrument employed is frequently unnoticed, “because” (to use the words of Maimonides, *More Nevochim*, Part II. chap. 41, fol. 55,) “of the well known and fundamental principle, that prophecy is communicated only by means of an angel.” He refers to Gen. xii. 1, xxxi. 3, and several other places.—Still, I rather think, that the view of most of the ancient Jews and Christian fathers, who thought that the divine person, who is afterwards denominated the Logos, is the being who manifests himself in several of the extraordinary appearances attributed to Jehovah under the old dispensation, is best supported by the general analogy of scripture in relation to this subject. See HENGSTENBERG’S *Christology*, Vol. I. p. 219 ss., Keith’s *Translation*, 164 ss., where the reader will find a great deal of valuable information, although he will hardly be able to acquiesce in all the learned author’s criticism and reasoning.

In order that the reader may judge for himself on this point, it may be well to call his attention to those portions of the book of Genesis which bear upon the subject.

After that under review, which is the first in order, the twenty-first chapter contains the next instance. Hagar, in her desolate condition, is almost reduced to despair at the prospect of her son’s death. “And God heard the voice of the lad; and the *angel of God* called to Hagar out of heaven, and said unto her, what aileth thee, Hagar? fear not, for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand; for *I* will make him a great nation.’ v. 17, 18. The most natural construction of these words is undoubtedly that which identifies the angel of God with the one who promises to make Ishmael a great nation. And, if this be the true construction, the angel claims divine prerogative; as it is not to be supposed that any creature would appropriate to himself the

power and will implied in the promise. If it should be said, that God himself is the speaker in the eighteenth verse, and that an ellipsis of 'and he saith,' or some such phrase, is to be supplied after the seventeenth, the possibility of this is not to be denied : indeed, under certain circumstances, such an ellipsis would be quite natural. But whether it were intended by the author, and the interpreter has therefore a right to claim this, and supply it, is entirely another question. An examination of other analogous places affords the most satisfactory ground of decision, and leads, I think, to the conclusion, that no such ellipsis was intended. This will appear from some of the texts which remain to be adduced.

The next passage bearing on the subject may be found in the twenty-second chapter. In the first verse, God is said to try Abraham, by commanding him to sacrifice his son. Jehovah's angel prevents the consummation of the act, and the language employed (v. 12,) to convey the prohibition, is most readily explained on the supposition, that he is himself a divine person : "Lay not thine hand upon the lad, for now I know that thou fearest *God*, seeing thou hast not withheld thine only son from *me*." Unless this be allowed, we must suppose an unnatural ellipsis of some phrase to indicate that God is the speaker. It cannot be objected to the view here preferred, that, if it were correct, the language would be this : "now I know that thou fearest *me*;" because the use of the noun for the pronoun is very common in Hebrew. Comp. xxxv. 1 ; and note 83, below.

The next passage is in chapter xxxi. By comparing the eleventh and thirteenth verses, it is evident, that "the angel of God" is said to declare himself to be "the God of Bethel," to whom Jacob had vowed a vow, as is related in xxxiii. 20—22. It would seem undeniable, that the patriarch regarded him as a really divine person. And, if this conclusion required any

confirmation, the language in xxxii. 9, would afford the fullest. For the being who commands his return to the land of his kindred is “Jehovah, the God of his fathers Abraham and Isaac.”

The same result is fairly attained by comparing xxxii. 28—30, with Hosea xii. 3, 4, 1 Kings xviii. 31, and 2 Kings xvii. 34. The same agent is denominated indifferently, *God*, *Jehovah*, *angel of God*, or of *Jehovah*. Compare also xxxv. 10 ss.

The last passage in the book of Genesis, is xlviii. 15, 16. “*God*, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, *the God* which fed me all my life long unto this day, *the angel* which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.” Here the God of Abraham and Isaac is plainly identical with the angel who delivered Jacob from the various evils which had surrounded him. Most certainly, this is Jacob’s own impression; and unless *this* angel is really divine, it would seem impossible to vindicate the patriarch from the charge of superstition and idolatry.

This view of the subject coincides with the plain meaning of certain texts elsewhere occurring in the Pentateuch. Thus in Ex. iii. 2, it is “*the angel* of Jehovah” that appears to Moses “in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush;” and yet, immediately afterwards, we read that *God* calls to him from the midst of the bush, declares the place to be holy, and avows himself to be *Jehovah*, *the God* of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. v. 4 ss.—In xiv. 19, also, “the *angel* of God” and “the pillar of the cloud” are said to go behind the Israelites; and in v. 24, *Jehovah* is represented as troubling “the host of the Egyptians” by looking “through the pillar of fire and of the cloud.” Dathe, indeed, in his note on Ex. xxxiii. 21, adopting the opinion of Herder, that any symbol or visible thing under which the invisible God displays himself, is called the angel or messenger of Jehovah,

says, that the burning bush and the fiery pillar are identical with the angel of Jehovah. But the arguments alleged in proof are unsatisfactory. Moses, it is said, *saw* merely the burning bush, and *heard* the voice speaking from it. But this is no evidence that the bush and the angel are the same thing, for the narrative does not tell us that Moses *saw* the angel: the appearance or manifestation is the whole transaction, comprehending the divine communication made to him at the time. The latter part of xiv. 19, is supposed to be exegetical of the former, and to convey precisely the same thought. But this is assuming the very point to be proved, as it may, with far greater probability and much more in accordance with scriptural analogy, be maintained, that the removal of the pillar was a natural consequence of the action before ascribed to the being who is denominated the angel of God.

It is worthy of notice, that the same language occurs in Num. xxii., where the narrative of Balaam's journey from Mesopotamia to the plains of Moab is narrated. "*God's* anger was kindled because he went," and "*the angel of Jehovah*" opposed him: v. 22 ss. And it is particularly remarkable, that, at the end of the interview, *the angel* declares himself to be the author of the communication which Balaam was to make: "the angel of Jehovah said unto Balaam, go with the men; but only the word that *I* shall speak unto thee, that thou shalt speak," v. 35. In the account which follows, "God," "Jehovah," is said to "meet Balaam;" Jehovah puts a word in his mouth, and the communications made to Balak are invariably ascribed to a divine origin.

Maimonides, in his *More Nevochim*, Part II. chap. 42, fol. 56, Berlin edition, p. 310, Buxtorf's Translation, considers the circumstance narrated in Num. xxii. as having taken place in prophetic vision; במראה הנבואה. In this view Dathe acquiesces. Dr. Palfrey, in his work before re-

ferred to, supposes Balaam to be relating to the messengers of Balak the substance of a divine communication which he pretended to have received in a dream, in which Jehovah had consented to his making the wished-for journey. Respecting these views of the transaction, my present purpose merely allows me to remark, that they are evidently at variance with the plain meaning of the chapter, which exhibits what took place after Balaam had commenced his journey. Comp. v. 21, with the subsequent narration, from which it is plain that Balaam is not relating a dream. Thus, also, was the narrative understood by the apostle St. Peter. 2 Pet. ii. 16.* Dr. Palfrey imagines Balaam to tell the princes of Moab, that “after persisting, in his dream, in the attempt to visit Balak, he heard himself *addressed by Jehovah’s angel*, who saw how determined he was, with permission to prosecute his journey.” p. 383. Both Balaam and the messengers of Balak are consequently supposed to consider Jehovah’s angel as a real personage. *On the Doctor’s theory*, then, this view of the personality of this agent is, at least, as *ancient as the time of Moses*. The question of its origination is worthy of his consideration.

(82.) Lot’s offer of his two daughters as a substitute for his guests, is not to be mentioned except in terms of the strongest reprobation. Viewed in any light, it was an unpardonable violation of duty. The fact that the sacred writers relate matters of this sort, and such as are mentioned towards the end of the chapter, respecting their most distinguished characters, is one among the many internal proofs of the correctness of their accounts. The sacredness of the rites of hospitality, and the very low estimate in which the

* I am aware that the genuineness of this epistle has been denied; but I think on grounds entirely insufficient. Its authenticity is quite susceptible of proof.

female character was held in ancient times, and, it may reasonably be supposed, particularly in so dissolute a place as Sodom, may be pleaded in palliation of this abominable offer. The host would feel his honor to be implicated, and, lest his guests should suspect him of treachery, would endeavor, by making the most unreasonable and even outrageous proposition, to assure them of his sincerity. Distracted too by various emotions, Lot may have been hardly conscious of what he was saying, the violence of his feelings suggesting the most extravagant declaration; as was afterwards the case with Reuben, when he endeavored to reconcile his father to Benjamin's accompanying his brothers to Egypt, by offering his own two sons to be slain by their grandfather, if he did not bring back the favorite. Gen. xlii. 37. Besides, as the narrative shows that the family of Lot had formed alliances in Sodom, which no doubt were with the most distinguished among its citizens, he would most probably presume, that the men would not dare to incur the vengeance to which the acceptance of such an offer would expose them. This consideration will derive additional force, if it be granted that the two daughters mentioned in the text (v. 8,) are the same as those who are spoken of in the fourteenth verse. Their being said to be "married" involves no great difficulty, as this may express their betrothed state, and their accepted suitors may be called Lot's "sons-in-law." And the words of the next verse, "thy two daughters which are here," does not prove that they had sisters living elsewhere with their husbands. However this may be, it is certain that Lot's domestic connexion with some of the families of Sodom, may have induced him to believe that his offer would be rejected.

(83.) The expression "brimstone and fire," denotes lightning producing sulphuric streams. Comp. Ps. xi. 6, where

the language is evidently formed on the narrative of this overthrow. See also Ezek. xxxviii. 22. From the fourteenth chapter it appears, that "the vale of Siddim," in which Sodom and Gomorrah were situated, (compare v. 10 with v. 3,) abounded with bituminous pits. The word rendered "slime" in our translation, is used to express some cohesive substance; that, for instance, which served to cement the bricks of which the tower of Babel was built, xi. 3, and to coat the ark of rushes in which the infant Moses was placed: Ex. ii. 3, where it is used in connexion with "pitch." It is, therefore, very suitable to express the nature of bitumen; and the name "lacus Asphaltites," which is sometimes applied to the Dead Sea, evidently alludes to this property of the soil. Of course, so combustible a substance would be readily enkindled by the lightning; and if, as some writers have conjectured, the country contained streams of Naphtha, the effect would be accelerated. The current of the Jordan, filling up the chasm which the burning of the bituminous substance must have occasioned, would form a lake. See a dissertation on the subject of the overthrow of Sodom and the other cities, in the *Bible de Vence*, Tom. I. p. 593 ss.

The expression in the text, "the Lord rained—from the Lord" is Hebraistic for, 'the Lord rained from himself.' The noun is used where most other languages would employ the pronoun. The same idiom occurs in 1 Kings viii. 1, "Solomon assembled the elders—unto king Solomon;" also, in Isa. vii. 11, "the Lord spake unto Ahaz, saying, ask a sign of the Lord;" in Matt. xii. 28, "if Satan cast out Satan;" and in various other places. It may be said, that, according to this view, the second noun, or the pronoun which would denote it, is inexplicable, as it cannot refer to the apparent source of the destructive flame, that being denoted by the phrase, "out of heaven." Hengstenberg assumes that this

phrase and the other "from himself" are "of the same import." Ubi sup. p. 220, Keith's Translation, p. 165. It must be granted to be unnecessary; but it is far from being inexplicable, such pleonasm being very frequent. Compare *ἐν ἑαυτῷ* in John vi. 61, xi. 38. It is possible that the pleonastic form may be used to express more strongly the idea, that this destructive element was sent and directed by the Lord. Compare the phrase "life in himself" in John v. 26.

(84.) As salt is sometimes used to express perpetuity, it has been suggested that the phrase "pillar of salt," may be equivalent to 'a perpetual pillar,' 'a standing monument.' Num. xviii. 19, and 2 Chron. xiii. 5, are appealed to in defence of this supposition; but without success, as in both instances עֹלָם is added, and the phrase 'a covenant of salt' is founded on the usage of eating salt together as a token of friendship, and denotes perpetuity, inviolable character. See Æneid XII. 173, "*dant fruges maribus salsas*;" and compare Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon, under מֶלַח II., and SUICER'S Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, under *ἁλᾶς* II. A.—Dathe translates מֶלַח נָצִיב וְהָיָה thus: "in solo salsuginoso hæsit infixa." No doubt the ground itself might be called *saline*, but the close connexion between נָצִיב and מֶלַח and the omission of the preposition, make it more probable that the former word is in construction with the latter. Lot's wife being suffocated, her person probably became gradually indurated and encrusted by the floating vapor. "Fragments of fossil salt in various forms are found in the vicinity of the Dead Sea,"* some one of which, no doubt Josephus mistook for this pillar, when he supposed himself to have seen it.

* See the authorities referred to in Robinson's Gesenius, under נָצִיב 2.

See his *Antiquities*, Lib. I. cap. xi. § 4.—Other views of the meaning of the phrase “pillar of salt,” may be seen in Suicer, *ubi sup.*, B.

(85.) The ingenious conjecture of Michaelis, that a part of Lot's flock may have been with their attendants in some district sufficiently remote from the scene of destruction to escape being involved in the ruin, is very probable. Had he sustained the loss of all his effects, it is reasonable to suppose that he would have resorted to Abraham, his noble-hearted and affectionate kinsman, between whom and himself, we have no reason to think that any other feelings than those of kindness and regard subsisted. We find that his daughters were able to procure wine; and, as it is difficult to suppose that they would have ventured to do what is related in the text, unless they hoped to deceive their father into the belief of their being other women, it is likely that they were not the only female inmates of the cave. Excessive, indeed, must have been Lot's want of consciousness, on the opposite supposition. The language of the elder daughter to her sister in v. 31, only shows that she apprehended all the men of that region to have been destroyed; an opinion perhaps hastily formed, and suggested by the terrific nature of the catastrophe. Indeed, she may have supposed her father, like a second Noah, to be the only male survivor of the conflagration, and that the earth was again to be peopled from one family. These are considerations which may serve in some degree to palliate the flagrant enormity.—Moab implies that the child owed its birth to her father. For the composition of the word, see Gesenius under מואב and מִי. Ben-Ammi, בֶּן-אֲמִי, is literally, ‘son of my people.’ It denotes that the child was born of the mother's own stock, without intercourse with one of any other line.

(86.) From the similarity of the leading circumstances in this chapter with those in xii. 10—20, it has been conjectured, that both these portions of the history are founded on the same fact. It must be acknowledged to be very remarkable, that two events so strikingly alike should have occurred in Abraham's life. But, if these portions of the book of Genesis are both genuine, (and not a particle of proof to the contrary exists, unless the improbability of the case be assumed as evidence,) it is impossible to explain them in reference to the same occurrence; unless, indeed, it could be allowed, against all reasonable evidence, that gross corruptions exist in one or other of the accounts.

The supposition, appearing in both the narratives, on which danger is apprehended, is that of Sarah's beauty. What is said in xvii. 17, xviii. 11, 12, contains nothing which is necessarily at variance with this idea. Women are sometimes to be met with of sufficient age to be in the situation in which she is described in the texts referred to, who are yet imposing and even beautiful in appearance. It is not unnatural, therefore, that, in those days, when the freshness of youth was doubtless proportioned to the length of life, and the mode of living was natural and simple, a woman of distinguished beauty should preserve some of her charms even to a late period of life. It ought also to be considered, that the attractions of a foreign lady, even if they had become somewhat diminished, may well be supposed sufficient to make an impression on an eastern prince, satiated, it may be, with indulgence in native beauty.

It is objected, that the event occurs twice in the life of Abraham, (xii. xx.,) and that a similar circumstance is related of Isaac, (xxvi. 6—10;) that Gerar, the name of the theatre of action, and Abimelech, that of the party concerned, are the same in the latter case of the father, and in that of the son. But, if such a brutal attack on private

rights may be supposed to have once taken place, it will surely be difficult to say why, under similar circumstances, a similar attack may not have been made more than once. With respect to Isaac, however, this was not the case. The narrative merely states his apprehension; but it does not appear that the anticipated evil did actually occur. The king of the country protected the daughter-in-law of Abraham. xxvi. 7—11.

Abimelech was probably the common name of those kings, as Pharaoh was of the Egyptian monarchs; and Phichol, (פִּיכֹל, 'mouth of all,') may also have been an appellation borne in common by the royal "captain," the commander of all, their spokesman also, bringing their petitions to the king. Compare xxvi. 26, with xxi. 22.

Respecting the narrative in the chapter before us, it may be remarked, however, that there is really nothing in the context which obliges us to place the event after those related in the previous chapter. The expression "from thence" in v. 1, carries us back to the "place" of Abraham's residence, (xviii. 33,) which we know to have been among the oaks of Mamre, where he had dwelt since the settlement of Lot in Sodom. Compare xviii. 1, xiv. 13, and xiii. 18. Consequently it only proves the event related to have occurred during some period of the time that Abraham resided in this place. Further still, there is plain proof, that it could not have occurred after the facts immediately before related. The birth of Lot's two sons, (xix. 37, 38,) must have been at least nearly a year after the promise repeated to Abraham in xviii. 10, which, in all probability, was verified about a year after it was made. If, therefore, the removal to Gerar took place after Lot's sons were born, it must have been nearly contemporaneous with Isaac's birth, which is contradicted by all the circumstances of the case. If it be supposed to have been contemporaneous with Lot's leaving Zoar, and taking

up his abode in the cave, and thus but a short time after the promise just referred to, still the difficulties will be inexplicable; for what is said in v. 17, 18, imply that some considerable time must have elapsed, in order to satisfy the Philistine family both of the infliction and of its removal. But this would oblige us to allow that in the meanwhile Isaac was born, which we know was not the case. Besides, the great age of Sarah (xviii. 11, xvii. 17,) makes it altogether improbable, that even her personal beauty could have been so great as to attract the king's attention, which the eleventh verse clearly enough intimates was the result that Abraham feared. On the whole, it is best to admit that this account is not in chronological order, and that the occurrence took place at a much earlier period than the connexion would lead us to suppose.

(87.) Verse 7: "he is a prophet." The proper and probably original meaning of this word is, 'one who speaks as God's substitute or ambassador.' Thus, in Exod. vii. 1, it is said, "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron shall be thy prophet;" of which the language in iv. 16, is explanatory: "he shall be thy *spokesman* unto the people:—he shall be to thee *instead of a mouth*, and thou shalt be to him *instead of God*." To the same purpose, Jer. xv. 19: "if thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be *as my mouth*." Among the Greeks *προφήτης* and *ὑποφήτης* seem to have been equivalent, 'one who speaks for,' (before,) or 'under,' that is, 'in the place of another.' See 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. "Prophecy came not in old time *by the will* of man; but holy men of old spake as they were moved by *the Holy Ghost*;" and with this text compare the passage from Philo quoted by HAHN in his *Lehrbuch des Christlichen Glaubens*, § 22, Anm. 3, p. 120, and also by Gesenius under *נָבִיא*: *προφήτης γὰρ ἴδιον μὲν οὐδεν ἀποφθεγγεται, ἀλλότρια δὲ πάντα ὑπη-*

χοῦντος ἐτῆρου. This is also a very usual sense of the word in the New Testament. The meaning of 'one who predicts future events' is secondary. Abraham, therefore, is announced to Abimelech as a sacred character, the interpreter of God, speaking as his agent.

(88.) The words of Abimelech to Sarah in v. 16 have been variously explained. The use of the term 'brother' for husband is suggested by the attempted deceit. If the pronoun אָבִי relate to Abraham, as Aben Ezra supposes, the translation will be as in the English version, "he is to thee a covering of the eyes unto, (with respect to,) all who are with thee;" that is, 'he is able to protect thee from any impertinence, to guard thy modesty.' Most critics, however, refer it to the money just mentioned, the כֶּסֶף, with which it agrees. This is sanctioned by the Septuagint χίλια διδραχμα—ταῦτα ἔσαι, and the Vulgate, "hoc erit." The Arabic also gives the same meaning, and most probably the Syriac. The sense usually given is as follows: 'it is for a covering of thine eyes;' it is intended to supply you with veils, 'for (with a view to,) all who are with you;' that is, in order that all who fall in company with you may perceive that you are married. It is further stated, that, in those early times, it was the usage for eastern women who were married to wear veils, perhaps as a token of subjection, (compare 1 Cor. xi. 10, 1 Pet. iii. 5, 6,) while maidens did not cover the face. See xii. 14, where Sarah passes for an unmarried woman; also xxiv. 16, 17, which shows that Rebecca's face was then uncovered, (compare xxix. 9 ss. ;) but when she is about to meet Isaac, v. 65, she puts on a veil, thus implying that she had become his wife. The suggestion of Abimelech is therefore a delicate reproof of Sarah for representing herself as Abraham's unmarried sister.

The exclusive use of the veil by married women is,

however, confidently denied by Gesenius, (see him under **בְּסוּרָה**.) who remarks, that “it is manifestly contrary to oriental custom, and is incapable of proof.” He does not take notice of the texts referred to, which appear to favor the usage just stated. His intimation, that one thousand shekels would be an exorbitant price for a veil, is no very strong objection, as it need not be presumed that the donor intended the whole sum to be appropriated to the purchase, but such a proportion as might be necessary. By the phrase “covering of the eyes,” he understands, “a present offered as an expiation for a fault, in order that one may *shut his eyes* upon it, connive at it.” Compare 1 Sam. xii. 3, “a bribe, to blind mine eyes therewith;” where, although the words are different, the sentiment is evidently the same.

Mendelsohn, in the **דָּרֶךְ מְלִיצָה**, gives the same view of the phrase “covering of the eyes.” His version is as follows: “Behold, I have given thy brother one thousand pieces of silver. These may serve thee as a satisfaction [amende honorable,] with respect to all who are with thee; but with respect to every other thou wilt be defended.” The interpretation of Rabbi Solomon of Dubno, printed in the same work, is to the same purpose: “**הַדָּבָר** (the thing which I have given him will be) **לְךָ כְּסוּת עֵינַיִם** to thee a covering of the eyes, (like **וּכְסָה** in Prov. xii. 16, that is, that no disgrace may attach to thee on account of this, and it may not be said that I have indulged my passion with thee.) To all who are with thee, (that is, thy household, or others who see this at present,) [he means who are witnesses of this satisfaction;] and with all, (that is, but with all the men who have not seen the honorable satisfaction which I have been obliged to make thee. **וְאֵת**, the **ו** has the sense of *but*.) **וְנִכְחַת** (thou wilt be defended by the men who have now seen thy satisfaction, who will publicly declare what their eyes have seen.) **נִכְחַת** is benoni feminine Niphal, the proper

form being לֹדְכָהָ or לֹדְכָתָ , the patuch being employed on account of the guttural, as in לֹדְעָתָ , the $_$ at the end of the verse being changed into $_$.”—The latter part of the verse is not clear. Dathe reads it, without regard to the Athnach under וְהָיָה , as forming a connected clause, and follows the Septuagint and Syriac, (he says also the Vulgate, but this is a mistake,) in omitting the vau before the last word. He considers this as the second person feminine of the preterite Niphal, from לָדַח (which, in that case, as the Jewish writer just quoted remarks, ought to be written וְלָדַחָהָ) and gives it the same meaning as it would have in the Hiphil or Hithpacl, ‘to show’ or ‘show one’s self.’ The result affords a very clear and intelligible sense, thus: ‘that to all who are with you as well as to all, (that is, whoever may see you,) you may be known;’ in other words, may appear as a married woman. Still there is no sufficient reason for departing from the masoretical reading. The word וְלֹדְכָתָ may be the benoni participle, as Rabbi Solomon says, and may have the meaning given by him. Or it may be the remark of the author, and in immediate connexion with the two preceding words. In either case, the $_$ is pleonastic, as is not unusual. Thus the meaning will be: ‘and in all,’ that is, as to the whole matter, the attempted deceit, ‘she was reprov’d,’ or convicted and silenced.

(89.) The conduct of Abraham in this affair, and also in that before related, chap. xii., as well as that of Isaac afterwards mentioned, xxvi. 7 ss., is not to be vindicated, however easy it may be to suggest considerations of a palliative kind. The want of entire reliance on divine Providence must be acknowledged; but that man must be very ignorant of his own heart, who does not feel that the frailty of nature would, in most minds, have suggested some expedient

equally unwarranted. It is possible that both these patriarchs may have resorted to a false representation with the view of preventing an attack immediately on their arrival, trusting at the same time to favorable circumstances for disclosing the real truth of the case. It may have been their object to anticipate immediate assault and outrage, and their hope to prevent any alliance by a timely representation of the real connexion. The behaviour of Abimelech is in part laudable, and in part otherwise. He did not know the relationship of Sarah to Abraham, and he immediately complies with the divine direction to restore her. If then it should be asked, wherein lay the justice of punishing him by afflicting his family, and also himself;* it may be replied, that the mere fact of his taking Sarah was culpable, inasmuch as it was an unwarranted aggression on the rights of the traveller; and, as it is not to be imagined that Abraham would have voluntarily surrendered his supposed sister, it was also an act of violence. The language of the latter part of the fifth, and the former of the sixth verses, must be explained by the immediately preceding context: Abimelech's "integrity and innocence" are granted so far as regards an intention of depriving the patriarch of his *wife*, and therefore, the mercy of God providentially interposes to prevent further criminality; but his conduct in seizing her at all still makes him censurable.

(90.) The word rendered "mocking" in v. 9, is derived from the same root as the name Isaac, and might be rendered 'laughing at.' The same verb is elsewhere used to express the grossest insult, as in the false accusation of Potiphar's wife, xxxix. 14, 17, "the Hebrew servant came

* It is clear from v. 17, that some personal affliction had fallen on Abimelech; perhaps sickness of some sort. Compare v. 3. 4, first clause, with the latter half of the 6th.

in unto me to mock me." Some old Jewish authorities speak of Sarah's having observed in Ishmael a disposition to idolatry and various vices. (See FAGIUS and DRUSIUS in loc.) But this is only a Rabbinical fiction. ACACIUS, quoted by the latter commentator, suggests whether the word פָּצַחַ may not mean 'fighting with and persecuting,' as in 2 Sam. ii. 14. But here the root is פָּצַחַ, (although it is most likely that both roots are of the same origin,) and the context shows the nature of the sport or "play," to use the word of our own version, that Joab meant. Besides, the supposition of personal violence in the case of Ishmael and Isaac, is wholly out of the question. Something insulting, and perhaps malicious and infidel, is all that the word in this connexion will bear. "He did not merely laugh," says Hengstenberg, (Authentic, I. p. 276.) "he made himself merry. The little helpless Isaac, a father of nations! Unbelief, jealousy, pride, led him to this behaviour. Want of faith made it appear to him ridiculous, to connect such great results with such a feeble cause." Neither does the use which St. Paul, in Gal. iv. 22 ss., makes of the facts here related require any stronger meaning. He may well apply the term "persecution," v. 29, to such conduct, particularly as he compares it with the treatment to which the true Christians of his day were subjected, by the advocates for the outward Jewish ceremonial in opposition to its spiritual import.

It has often been objected to this narrative, that Abraham's conduct towards Hagar and Ishmael was unfeeling, unworthy alike of a kind master and an affectionate father, both which characters his history in general represents him as sustaining in a very high degree. In reply it may be said, that the patriarch himself was greatly distressed at the thought of complying with his wife's wishes, and his consent was gained only in consequence of a divine direction;

that the melancholy condition of Hagar and Ishmael in the wilderness was owing to unforeseen and fortuitous circumstances; that the providence of God had in view the separation of Isaac and his family from Ishmael and his connexions, (compare xxv. 6,) to preserve the promised race as a distinct body, in order to carry into effect the plan which he had formed; and that the occurrences here mentioned had a direct tendency to form the character of Ishmael and his posterity, leading to their national distinction, and were therefore ultimately beneficial to him. That he was consequently forever afterwards excluded from intercourse with his father's family, is neither stated in the history, nor reasonable in itself. The fact that he united with Isaac in the last honors paid to Abraham's body, (xxv. 9,) affords presumptive evidence to the contrary, and favorable to the opinion that the two brothers lived in harmony. This defence, it can hardly be questioned, is sufficiently satisfactory.

There is, however, another consideration which appears to me to afford an additional reason for the conduct of divine Providence as here exhibited. St. Paul, as above referred to, teaches us that the facts here related were intended to convey allegorical instruction. The words, v. 24, *ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα*, are no doubt incorrectly rendered in our version, "which things are an allegory," for the Greek will not allow such a translation, nor does the idea which it most naturally suggests meet with any encouragement from the author's writings. The apostle never represents the historical facts of the Old Testament as allegories. But it is equally clear, on the other hand, that he does represent the facts under consideration as designed, in the same manner as parables, to convey religious instruction. Some commentators have indeed resorted to the convenient hypothesis of accommodation to the allegorical method of interpreta-

tion, which, they say, was then prevalent among the Jews. A few, allowing that this is not in character with St. Paul's ordinary mode of instruction, are of opinion, that he does himself intimate to the reader his intention of accommodating to the Jewish usage, in the application which he is about to make of the facts immediately recounted. This intimation is, they think, conveyed in the twentieth verse, where he expresses his "desire to change his voice," that is, to alter his general method of instruction, or to adapt himself to each one's thought and feeling, thus condescending to the erroneous use of allegory, in accommodation to their Jewish weakness and prejudice. See HAHN'S *Lehrbuch*, § 14, *Amm.* 2, p. 65; and his treatise on the Grammatico-Historical Interpretation of the Scriptures, published in the *Biblical Repository*, Vol. I. No. I. p. 133. That this view of the clause is forced and unnatural, will be granted by almost every candid mind. The apostle's question in v. 21, "do ye not hear the law?" "do ye not perceive and attend to what the scripture itself intimates?" evidently shows, that he not only considered the instruction which he was about to convey as implied in the facts recorded, but that his readers might themselves have drawn from the record some such instruction. In a word, he considers Sarah and her son as prefigurative of the Christian church and its spiritual members, while Hagar and Ishmael represent the Jewish community devoted to an external religion, characterized by elementary principles, mere rites and ceremonies of a fleshly nature. If then it be allowed that this is the true view of the case, and if the facts here stated were intended to be emblematic of what was afterwards to exist under the Gospel, the vast importance of the things adumbrated affords an additional reason why divine wisdom should allow the influence of Sarah's feelings to lead to the expulsion of Ishmael and his mother, with the whole train of occurrences that followed

it. Such a view of the facts is in harmony with the scriptural representation of the connexion of the old and new covenants, which is illustrated by the doctrine that the one was intended to be symbolical of the other.

(91.) The word שָׁלַחָהּ, rendered “she cast,” may possibly express the wretched mother’s despair, as if in frenzied agony she had thrown off from her the son of her love. This would not be unnatural. But it does not require such a meaning. It is used by Reuben when he proposes to put Joseph into a pit, while at the same time he is planning his safety; xxxvii. 22. Neither in this verse nor in the twenty-fourth, where it occurs again, can it fairly require any stronger meaning than *placed* or *put*. In the first and last of these three passages, the Septuagint has ἐρριψεν and ἐρριψαν, and in the second, ἐμβάλλετ. But neither do these words necessarily imply force, as is plain from Matt. ix. 38, xv. 30. The text simply states that Hagar laid her exhausted child on the ground.

(92.) The Septuagint renders the Hebrew שָׁמַיָּה, lofty, considering the word probably as derived from הָרָא to see. To the same purpose Aquila, καταφανῆ, and perhaps Symmachus, τῆς ὁπτασίας, followed by the Vulgate, *terram visionis*; although it is not improbable that these terms are in allusion to the name given to the place by Abraham. See v. 14. The Syriac translator appears to have read a different text, for he renders it, “the land of the Amorites.” It is no doubt the name of that region of country, on a part of which the temple was afterwards built. See 2 Chron. iii. 1. This may perhaps account for the remarkable version found in the Chaldee, and Arabic, both of which have ‘the land of worship;’ בְּלֵךְ אֲלֵעִבָּדָהּ, אַרְצָהּ פְּלִיחָהּ.

(93.) The preparation of the wood, and the transportation of it to such a distance, seems at first view a very unnecessary inconvenience, as Abraham might reasonably expect to find fuel at the appointed place. Perhaps it was done that the wood might be dry. Perhaps, too, it was usual to prepare the fuel used on sacrificial occasions in some particular way. The Jews, during the time of the second temple, were very careful to procure clean wood, and therefore priests, who on examination were discovered to have any blemish, were set to remove the worms that might be found in it, and rooms connected with the court of the women were appropriated to this purpose. See *Lightfoot's Temple Service*, chap. xviii. 2, *Works*, Vol. I. fol. p. 1093, London, 1684. It is very probable that even the ceremonial of sacrifice was observed, in this early period, with great regard to circumstance, however unimportant in itself.

(94.) The language of the fifth verse is worthy of more than ordinary attention. Is it the language of deceit? Under circumstances of such appalling interest, does the patriarch assure his servants that he and his son would return to them when the act of worship was over, while at the same time he expected to leave the bones of his son Isaac on the altar from which the smoke of his sacrificed body had ascended? I think not. Surely this is the language of faith: Abraham is persuaded that, in some way or other, Jehovah would interpose to prevent the final loss of his son, through whom alone the divine promises could be ratified. And the same faith prompts the reply in the eighth verse. That he did cherish such a persuasion, is a result to which we are led solely from the narrative. Either he believed that his God would interpose and prevent the sacrifice; or he expected that he would raise to life again the victim,

should he choose to insist upon the offering. The remark of the inspired author of the epistle to the Hebrews, "reasoning (λογισάμενος,) that God was able to raise up even from the dead," xi. 19, is in favor of the latter supposition. And this coincides with the opinion, supported by indirect evidence of very early antiquity derived from the Old Testament and from other sources, that the doctrine of the resurrection, or union of soul and body after death, was known and cherished by the patriarchs. The striking passage in Job xix. 23—27, which has so often been appealed to on this subject, is of itself satisfactory evidence.

(95.) Borger, in the work before referred to, p. 135, adduces the account of the offering of Isaac as a proof that the patriarch claimed unlimited power over his son's life. But this cannot be supported. It is impossible, indeed, to ascertain what was Isaac's age at this period; but the narrative contains nothing inconsistent with the opinion, that in consequence of representations made by his father, he voluntarily submitted to the divine requisition. And as no time seems more favorable for such a disclosure than that in which the inquiry was made, we may reasonably presume it to have been then communicated.

(96.) The name given to the place no doubt refers to the reply of Abraham to his son. Compare v. 8 and 14. In the latter אֲשֶׁר 'which,' is used for כַּאֲשֶׁר 'as,' as in Jer. xxxiii. 22, and elsewhere; and the particle of comparison כִּי seems to be omitted before בְּהֵרָא, agreeably to ordinary usage, of which we have a striking instance in Ps. cxxxix. 15, "I was made in secret, and curiously wrought (as) in the lowest parts of the earth." According to the Rabbinical punctuation, to vary from which no good reason can be assigned, the meaning is as follows: 'And Abraham called the

name of that place, the Lord will provide, as it is said to-day, (as) in the mount of the Lord, it shall be provided.' It would seem that the language of Abraham, 'God will provide, &c.' had given rise to a proverb, expressive of the Almighty's interposition for the deliverance of his people in difficulties. Nothing could be better adapted to encourage such an expectation, than the words by which the patriarch's faith had been avowed, when viewed in connexion with the result, by which they were so remarkably verified.

(97.) The infidel objections which have so often been urged against the narrative contained in this chapter, lose their force, when the motives by which the divine mind was influenced are taken into consideration. The command given to Abraham to offer up his son, has been appealed to, in order to prove that human sacrifices are recognized in the narrative as agreeable to the will of God. But such an inference is in direct opposition to the whole revealed law, and the result in this case affords an argument equally strong for the very contrary position. It is a good remark of Le Clerc on this portion of sacred history, that it is introduced in order to show, that although human victims were not offered to God by his true worshippers, yet this did not arise from any unwillingness on their part to sacrifice the best and dearest.

Another reason for the transaction under review may be found in the very language which introduces it: "God did try Abraham." It was intended as a test of his faith; not, of course, for the satisfaction of the Omniscient, nor altogether to strengthen and increase the patriarch's habit of virtue; but also to afford an example and a lesson of instruction to all succeeding ages. See Rom. xv. 4. Hengstenberg (*ubi sup.* II. p. 139,) supposes, that the command in the second verse was not intended to be understood literally; that a

spiritual offering of Isaac is all that was required : that the trial lay in the ambiguity of the language employed ; and that Abraham *misapprehended* (p. 146.) the meaning ! But this view of the subject is evidently unfounded. The words of the command are too plain to allow of misconstruction : and had they admitted the figurative meaning which he ascribes to them, the parent's heart would doubtless have prompted such an exposition. A spiritual offering of Isaac could be nothing more than an entire dedication of him to God's service, which the character of the father shows had already been done. The objection of this learned writer, that God, who can neither lie nor repent, could not afterwards have recalled his order, is hardly worthy of notice, as the Scripture furnishes us with so many instances of divine directions being modified by varying circumstances. His other objection is, that what the divine law declared to be impious, God cannot have commanded even in the way of a trial. But, surely, the divine lawgiver may counteract his own law in a case not necessarily involving moral evil, and he who has a right to the lives of all may require any one to be taken, in whatever manner and by whomsoever he pleases. The conduct of God toward Abraham is in some respects similar to that of our Lord toward the Canaanitess related in Mark vii. 27 ss. In neither case is it right to judge of the divine motive, without being governed by a view of the divine conduct in the whole transaction. The countermanding of the order in the twelfth verse, is necessarily to be considered, in forming a just conception of the motive by which it was originally prompted.

If it be correct to regard the sacrifice of Christ as prefigured by the intended offering of Isaac, another reason will be afforded for this remarkable transaction. It must be granted, that no positive declaration to this effect is made in Scripture. The language of our Lord in John viii. 56,

“your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad,” may indeed have been intended to bear upon this fact in the patriarch’s life, as well as others which the brevity of his history has passed over without notice; but it is too indeterminate to justify a positive conclusion. And the only other passage which can be supposed to sustain such a typical relation, Heb. xi. 19, is susceptible of a very clear and intelligible exposition, independently of any such connexion. The sacred writer may intend to say, that, speaking figuratively (*iv παραβολῇ*?) Abraham had originally received his son from the dead, referring to the circumstances of his birth. Compare Rom. iv. 19, and Heb. xi. 12. Or, as appears to me more probable, he may allude to the situation in which Isaac was placed on the occasion under review, when he was in imminent danger of destruction, and rescued, as one may say, from the very jaws of death. But, although there is no direct proof afforded by any specific declaration of Scripture, from which it may be concluded that the sacrifice of Isaac was typical of that of Christ: yet the contrary is not hastily to be inferred. May there not be a typical relationship which is not explicitly asserted? May it not be left to the pious, candid, and intelligent believer, to ascertain in some cases such relationship by a comparison of circumstances, and by the analogy of Scripture? Allowing, as such an one must, the typical character of those persons and facts which the New Testament so exhibits by unequivocal declaration, are we consequently to deny that such a character can possibly be maintained of any others? No doubt a multitude of well-meaning writers have run to unwarranted extremes on this subject, finding typical associations in minute and most fanciful resemblances, where nothing of the sort was intended.* But it is an axiom which

* I might illustrate this remark, by referring the reader to the so-called epistle of BARNABAS, among works of antiquity, and among

no well balanced mind rejects, that the abuse of a principle does not take away its legitimate use. So extraordinary a fact as that before us would be a fit symbol of that most extraordinary of all facts, "the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Several similar circumstances might be mentioned respecting each, constituting an analogy, certainly not less striking than that pointed out in the epistle to the Hebrews, between several particulars of the Mosaic service and those facts of the Christian dispensation, which we are there taught to regard as correspondent.

(98.) Machpelah seems to have been the name of the place, (v. 9, 17,) derived perhaps from the circumstance of its containing a double cave : מִקְפֶּלֶה from כָּפֶל to double.— It is remarked by Le Clerc, that the length of the sentence in the seventeenth and eighteenth verses, and the particularity with which the land is designated, agree well with the supposition, that it is a part of the legal document which secured the purchase.

I cannot acquiesce in the remarks made from a writer in the Pictorial Bible by Professor Bush, in his account of the transaction of Abraham and the Hittite chief. "This Ephron is the first of that nation who comes under our notice ; and his tone and manner on this occasion do no great credit to his tribe. We are not surprised that Ephron's respectful and seemingly liberal conduct has been beheld favorably in Europe, for only one who has been in the east can properly appreciate the rich orientalism it exhibits."

modern compositions, to BUNYAN'S Solomon's Temple Spiritualized, or to McEWEN on the Types. But to show that even a learned and able divine may be led away into wild extravagances on this point, I prefer directing his attention to VITRINGA'S remarks on the typical character of Joseph and Samson, in his *Observationes Sacre*, Lib. VI. cap. xxi. xxii.

The affair is then represented as an ostentatious and hypocritical offer of Ephron, arising out of his wish "to lay so great a person as Abraham under obligation," with the view of "obtaining a present of much more than equal value in return." But the patriarch "understands these matters, and is not disposed to receive such obligation." The depth of his grief on occasion of the death of his long-beloved Sarah, does not prevent his conducting himself, in making arrangements for her suitable interment, with a shrewd and wary foresight respecting his pecuniary interests. In plain words, the Hittite was a cunning and unfeeling sharper, and Abraham too knowing a dealer to be deceived by him! It is hard, to make any selfish pretence of generosity which may characterize some modern Persians, and the cautious circumspection of an experienced traveller, always apprehensive of being overreached, the rule whereby to judge a very ancient Canaanitish tribe, and a generous, open-hearted prince like Abraham.

(99.) It appears from the fiftieth verse, that Laban, Rebecca's brother, acts conjointly with her father in relation to the proposed marriage. This accords with the influence which brothers exercised in disposing of sisters, and is illustrated by the case of Dinah in chap. xxxiv. 11 ss. See also Judges xxi. 22.—The phrase "bad or good," in the latter clause of the same verse, is equivalent to the Hebraism "from good to bad" in xxxi. 24, 29; and the meaning is, 'we have nothing to say on this subject, it is evidently the working of Providence.'

(100.) It would seem, that the constitution of Abraham must have been greatly strengthened, if not renovated, since the time immediately preceding the last promise of Isaac's birth. This supposition appears necessary, in order to re-

concile the fact of his having so many children by Keturah, with the texts referred to in the latter part of note (58,) above. That he did not marry her until after Sarah's death, is evident from the arrangement of the narrative and the whole series of the history. Mr. Bush, in his note on xxv. 1, follows some of the older commentators in supposing Keturah to have been Abraham's concubine during the life-time of Sarah. But the arguments alleged in favor of this opinion do not appear to be of much weight. If, on the supposition of her having been a second wife, there is any difficulty in her being called a concubine in Chronicles, there is, on the other hand, a difficulty in her being called his wife in Genesis, on the supposition of her having been merely a concubine. "The silence of Moses about her pedigree" certainly proves nothing. It was his great design to show the accomplishment of the promise through Isaac; and, therefore, the mother of any other of Abraham's children must be comparatively a very insignificant personage in his estimation. The "improbability that Abraham would make an alliance with any family of the Canaanites, and that any princess of Canaan would accept of him, in his old age, when the whole inheritance was to go to Sarah's son," no more supports the opinion "that Keturah was a concubine," than a wife "taken from among the servants of his family." The author asks: "was the interval sufficient, between Sarah's death and Abraham's, for six sons to be born to him of one woman, and grow up to manhood, when manhood hardly took place before the age of thirty at soonest?" Without stopping to inquire whether an age of thirty years was necessary to the attainment of manhood at that period, it is sufficient to reply, that a comparison of xvii. 17, xxiii. 1, and xxv. 7, shows that Abraham outlived Sarah thirty-eight years, a space of time quite sufficient to satisfy the demand. The other objection drawn from his advanced age and corporeal

debility, shortly before the time of Isaac's birth, is answered by allowing that there was "a continuance of his physical vigor," in consequence of a miraculous restoration of it.

The last objection just noted would oblige the Professor to allow the birth of these six sons to have taken place before that of Isaac. But this is inconsistent with the narrative, which always represents Abraham as childless until the birth of Ishmael, who is afterwards uniformly mentioned as his only son until Isaac is born. See xv. 2, xvii. 18—21, 25, 26.

(101.) Keturah was Abraham's wife in the proper sense of the term; yet she is regarded as inferior to Sarah, whom the patriarch first married, and with whom he lived so long, and in 1 Chron. i. 32, she is consequently called his concubine. Her children, therefore, and the son of Hagar, are probably the persons intended in the sixth verse.

PART VIII. CHAP. XXV. 12—18.

(102.) See note (74.)

PART IX. CHAP. XXV. 19—XXXV. 29.

(103.) The name Esau, עֵשָׂו is derived by many commentators, both Jewish and Christian, from עָשָׂה to make, to form, and is thought to express the child's comparatively complete formation at the time of his birth, when he is supposed to have been at least as hairy as a grown man. But this seems very strained. It is better to derive the word from the Arabic, عَشَى to be hairy. Esau's other name Edom, meaning red, is that by which his posterity are generally distinguished. Its origin is stated in v. 30.—Jacob,

יִשְׁקֹב is from שָׁקַב to hold the heel, (compare Hos. xii. 4 ;) hence, to supplant, (Gen. xxvii. 36.)

(104.) The Hebrew is אִישׁ זָהָב. Our English translation, following probably the Septuagint ἄπλῆς, and the Vulgate simplex, renders it “a plain man.” So also the Geneva version, with the marginal note, “simple and innocent.” LYRA has “simplex” with the note, “sine plica dolositatis!”* Cranmer’s Bible, more correctly, because exactly according to the original, translates it “a perfect man,” as the same word, when used of individuals, is often rendered in the ordinary version. No doubt the author intends to describe Jacob as a religious man. And, in all probability, this character of the patriarch is intimated also by the next words, “dwelling in tents.” This language is sometimes used in contradistinction to settlement in a permanent or well-fortified residence. Thus in Num. xiii. 19, “whether they dwell in tents or strong holds;” also in Jer. xxxv. 7, “neither shall ye build house, &c., but all your days ye shall dwell in tents;” and again in the ninth and tenth verses. And the author of the epistle to the Hebrews speaks of Abraham as “a sojourner in the land of promise, dwelling in tents as well as Isaac and Jacob,” and contrasts their unsettled habitation with the “city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.” xi. 9, 10. Here it may be well to trace some of the prominent features which characterize the two brothers, Jacob and Esau. In doing this, I shall be guided considerably by the remarks of Drechsler in the work already referred to.

Esau, it would seem, belonged to the class of rough,

* Such translations naturally suggest the inquiry, whether the authors did not thereby intend to shield Jacob against the charge of cunning, which might seem to be founded on some parts of his history.

sensual natures, men, who, acting under the influence of present impulse, have no steadiness of character. They are distinguished by an imposing directness of conduct, the very opposite to any thing deceitful or cunning. They have feeling and kindness; they readily forget an injury, and cherish no malice. These amiable qualities are associated, however, with levity, sensuality, and passion, leading to acts of violence, as circumstances may prompt. That Esau's character was of this nature is evident, as well from the advantageous points which his history discloses, as from the contrary. Were we to form an opinion of the two brothers from one or two insulated facts, we should probably decide in favor of the elder. The narrative in chap. xxxiii. 3, 4, for instance, considered by itself, is unquestionably much in favor of Esau. The one bows himself seven times to the ground in the presence of his elder brother; the other, yielding to the heart's impulse, rushes forward with the fraternal embrace. The whole interview shows Esau to have been a man of heart and feeling, kindly disposed, glad to do a favor, and uninfluenced by any selfish considerations. See particularly xxxiii. 9.

Favorable also to the character of Esau is the statement, that when he observed that the choice of his Hittite wives was disagreeable to his parents, he endeavored to make a more acceptable selection. See xxviii. 9. Hereby, however, nothing more is proved than this, that he would not openly and boldly oppose his parents. That he consulted their wishes does not appear from the narrative, neither is it in itself probable, as they would most likely have suggested a different choice. And his former union with the Canaanitish women shows, that he lightly appreciated those divine directions, by which his father and brother were governed in the choice of companions for life.

If it be asked, what it is that makes Jacob's character so

particularly deserving of estimation, the answer is this: 'his whole life was spent in the faith of the God of his fathers.' It was this divine principle which governed him from his earliest years. Even in the purchase of his birthright, unkind and ungenerous as was the act under existing circumstances, it was not without an influence. It was not his own personal worldly advantage which he had in view, but rather the future prosperity, temporal, spiritual, and eternal, of his progeny. Esau, who "despised his birthright," received his possessions earlier than Jacob. He founded a nation without subjecting his progeny to any disgrace like that which the descendants of Jacob experienced in Egypt. But, to be the heir of the promise, to acquire possession of Canaan, to be associated with God in Abraham's covenant,—this elevated calling was supposed to be connected with the rights of the first-born. See xv. 13—16. The sensual Esau esteemed all this at a very low rate. With him the passion of the present moment predominated. Jacob, on the other hand, had his thoughts fixed on the divine promises, and therefore he obtained the blessing of Abraham, (xxvii. 28, 29, xxviii. 3, 4, 13, 14,) which, indeed, had been secured to him by divine right before his birth, (xxv. 23 ss.,) and to which he had acquired a human claim by purchase, (xxv. 29 ss.,) although in a manner much to be censured.

In order to prepare himself for the accomplishment of the divine purpose, he is obliged, partly by adverse circumstances, and partly in order to form a matrimonial connexion with his father's family, to go to Mesopotamia. The latter cause is not to be regarded as incidental and of little weight, for all such connexion with the nations of Canaan was strictly prohibited and carefully guarded against, both by Abraham and Isaac. See xxiv. 2—9, and xxviii. 1, 2, 6; and compare xxvii. 46, and xxvi. 25.

On his journey to Mesopotamia, Jacob shows his religious character, in devoting himself and a reasonable proportion of his property to the service of God. See xxviii. 20—22. While residing with his uncle Laban, who attempted to abuse in his person the rights of hospitality and the claims of relationship, he commits the prosperity of his enterprises to God. xxx. 32, 33, xxxi. 7, 9—13, 42. On his return, in the apprehension of danger, he trusts to the same almighty defence, exercising a religious faith with suitable humility. xxxii. 9—12. Doubtless he might have settled himself advantageously in Mesopotamia, but duty required his return to Canaan, and he religiously obeyed the call. xxxi. 3, 13. The same character displays itself in the remainder of his life. In his old age he undertakes a journey to Egypt, to meet his much-loved and long-lost son; but not until his devotions had been favored with the divine answer, and a direction to settle there for a season, with the promise that his posterity, having there become a great nation, should, by the good providence of God, return to Canaan. xlv. 1—4. The same religious faith leads him to require from Joseph in particular, and again from his sons in general, a solemn assurance that his body should be interred in the promised land, where his fathers lay, (xlvii. 29—31, xlix. 29—32,) and which he doubted not his descendants would occupy. All this is in unison with that religious ardor which prompted the language, "I will not let thee go, unless thou bless me." xxxii. 26.

In giving this view of Jacob's religious character, I have no intention of vindicating all his conduct. His constitutional prudence sometimes degenerated into coldness, and led him to take advantage of the warmer feelings of his less considerate brother. His characteristic shrewdness occasionally displayed itself in artifice and perhaps deceit. And it is not to be denied, that the narrative which describes the

meeting of the brothers, (xxxiii.) represents the younger in a less favorable light than the elder. He is reserved and distant; his manner of approaching his brother is marked by that obsequiousness which characterizes the eastern dependent. Still, it is necessary to consider Jacob's situation, in order to form a correct opinion of his behaviour. He had good reason to dread a meeting which might expose him to his brother's resentment, which he could not be unconscious was in some measure deserved. He knew that before his flight to Mesopotamia, Esau had resolved on bloody vengeance. xxvii. 41, 42. He knew the rough, passionate nature of his brother, and feared some hasty ebullition of unguarded temper. Himself less governed by feeling, less prompt to hasty action, the peaceable shepherd, many of whose years had been spent in the humble situation of a servant, conducting a multitude of dependents, children, feeble women and unprotected flocks, he could not but tremble at the approach of an injured brother, who made his appearance with an armed force as the independent lord of Seir, to trample down, as he might reasonably suppose, the servile supplanter, and to crush and scatter his weak and defenceless company. Prudence also dictated to Jacob the propriety of satisfying his brother that he was in no condition to claim rights of primogeniture, and that in him no competitor could be expected. He assumes, therefore, without hesitation, the deportment of a submissive inferior, and acknowledges the elder brother as his "lord Esau." The latter, melted into kindness, urges Jacob to continue in his company. Well acquainted with Esau's mutability of character, knowing that, under different circumstances, his good nature and generosity of feeling might turn to overheated passion, and that, forgetful of the past, he might be hurried into some hasty and extravagant act, Jacob cautiously and very prudently declines. He is well aware that

the brotherly feeling of the mighty chieftain of Edom might rapidly pass away, "like the morning cloud, or the early dew."

The conduct of Jacob, as related in xxx. 25—43, has been the occasion of no little animadversion. He has been accused of overreaching his mother's brother by deceit and artifice. If the contents of this portion of the chapter could be viewed in no other light than this, then, indeed, there would be a great difficulty to resolve, namely, to account for such a procedure being related in the Bible. Certainly it does not comport with the object of this sacred book, to relate instances of cunning merely for the purpose of amusement. It does, indeed, mention the frailties and sins of holy men, but always with some definite object in view. The falsehood of Abraham and Isaac in denying their wives, the imposition which Jacob was induced to practise on his blind and aged father, David's infamous conduct in the affair of Bathsheba, have all a historical and moral and religious bearing. But what could lead to the introduction of an account of such a crafty device as this is asserted to have been? In order rightly to understand such a portion of the Bible as that under consideration, it is necessary to have right views of the character of the Bible. That exposition must necessarily rest on an erroneous basis, which assumes that the sacred writer could have in view any other than a sacred purpose; that he could, by any possibility, have intended to exhibit a well planned and successful piece of cunning, or some remarkable *lusus naturæ*, brought forward on account of its extreme rarity. Such views are abhorrent to every well-ordered and serious mind.

Jacob is treated most unrighteously by the selfish Laban, and reduced to extremity. The narrative relates the particulars. His own conduct had been in all respects unexceptionable and honorable, and divine Providence had blessed

his hard labors, increased his gains, and thus inflicted merited punishment on the churlish Laban. In the arrangement which constitutes the ground of objection, Jacob proposes that the only wages to be received by him shall be the result of circumstances, which were altogether beyond the reach of human reasoning and calculation, much more of human action. Whatever light modern inquiries in physiology may throw on the phenomena in contemplation, by alleging instances of the wonderful power of imagination on the female when in the circumstances suggested in the text, it is hardly to be supposed, that Jacob's knowledge of the mysteries of nature could have been so profound as to lead him, of his own accord, to adopt the course related, particularly as he risked his very subsistence on a result, which, considered as a natural effect merely, he could not but have known to be extremely problematical. Surely, it was the patriarch's childlike, implicit faith in the divine direction, communicated to him in the ordinary manner, which impelled his conduct. Compare xxxi. 9—12. See farther on this subject in note (118.)

(105.) The privileges of the birthright consisted in precedence over the other brothers, and a double patrimony. See Gen. xlix. 3, 4, Deut. xxi. 17, 1 Chron. v. 1, 2. To this some add the right of the priesthood. The opinion is certainly of very high antiquity, as it is expressly stated in the Chaldee Targum on Gen. xlix. 3, where the priestly authority is mentioned as that part of Reuben's rights of primogeniture which fell to the tribe of Levi. See the Note on that text. It is supposed also by most Jewish and Christian commentators, that "the priests" mentioned in Exod. xix. 22, and the "young men" in xxiv. 5, are the first-born, who being consecrated to God, (see xiii. 2,) became priests, in place of whom the Levites were afterwards substituted. Num. iii.

45. But the argument assumes the very points in dispute, namely, that the consecration of the first-born was an investing of them with the priesthood, and that the priests and young men referred to were identical with the first-born, neither of which can be proved. Besides, the Levites who took the place of the first-born, were not priests, but only attendants or servants of the sanctuary; and "the priesthood" which they are said "to receive," in Heb. vii. 5, (if, indeed, the whole body of Levites are there intended, which it is impossible to prove,) must be understood in a limited sense. That Esau is called "a profane person," (Heb. xii. 16,) for thus parting with his birthright, would indeed be clearly explicable on the ground that the priestly office made a part of it. But it is equally so, if the rights of primogeniture were regarded in the patriarchal age as comprehending any spiritual blessings; which it would be unreasonable, and in opposition to the general representations of Scripture, to deny. If the expected deliverer were supposed to be a descendant from the eldest son, Esau's profanity in despising the honor of being ancestor of such an offspring, requires no illustration. It is little less than despising the benefits which were expected to flow from this personage. His readiness in yielding to his brother's proposition, and the sentiment along with which he expresses his determination, shows clearly enough that his views were limited to personal gratification. "I am at the point to die, and what profit shall this birthright do to me?" It is not to be supposed, that Esau was in danger of immediate death for want of food in his father's house: his language is of that extravagant hyperbolical character, which could be occasioned by nothing less than a vehement desire for the food before him, and a very low estimate of the value of the price demanded for it. The subject of the priesthood, considered as one of the rights of primogeniture,

is ably discussed by Vitringa, and settled in the negative, in his *Observationes Sacræ*, Lib. II. cap. ii. iii. p. 271—300. Buddæus, ubi sup. Per. I. sect. iii. p. 389 ss., has taken some notice of his Dissertation, without succeeding, however, in refuting his arguments.

(106.) Beer, בְּאֵר, means a well, and שָׁבַע, to swear, whence שְׁבוּעָה an oath: שֶׁבַע is the word for seven. The oath is no doubt the principal circumstance giving rise to the name. This is plain from the language in xxi. 31; “therefore he called the name of that place, Beer Sheba, בְּאֵר שָׁבַע, (without the athnach שֶׁבַע;) because there *they* *swore*, נִשְׁבָּעוּ, both of them. “Still, as Hengstenberg remarks, neither שֶׁבַע nor שְׁבוּעָה ever means oath. He considers the bringing of seven sheep as the usual symbol, by means of which the compact and oath were ratified; so that both phrases are equivalent. See his *Authentic des Penta-teuches*, I. p. 277.

(107.) The ardent attachment of Isaac to his elder son doubtless strengthened his natural desire, that the divine blessing should flow to posterity through him. The same preference of the elder son appears in the case of Joseph. See Gen. xlviii. 17, 18. It is reasonable to think, that Rebecca’s particular affection for Jacob confirmed her in the impression, that he was destined to become the more distinguished of her two children. Indeed, the prediction made to her before they were born, no doubt gave her mind a bias especially favorable to Jacob, which would naturally be increased by his domestic habits. Perhaps she saw in her husband an undue partiality for the elder brother; and, apprehensive of its consequences in diverting the blessing from the intended channel, may have supposed herself justified in resorting to the crafty expedients which the narrative

recounts. The lawfulness of religious frauds, as such attempts to advance the cause of God have by a strange misnomer been called, has been maintained by some men of the very highest distinction in the Christian church, from a very early age. It is not therefore to be assumed that Rebecca had clear ideas of obligation in all points, and consequently our censures of her conduct ought to be modified by a correct view of her religious and moral knowledge. Certainly the divine promise needed no deceitful efforts, either on the part of Jacob or his mother, to verify its accomplishment; *non talibus auxiliis*. Neither human "wrath" nor human cunning is necessary to "work the righteousness of God." James i. 20.

It is much to be lamented, that both Jewish and Christian writers of authority have too often attempted to vindicate, or at least greatly to excuse, certain conduct of the patriarchs and other personages of Scripture, as if their general faith and piety stamped correctness on every action of their lives. Miserable are the subterfuges by which it has been attempted to elicit morality and truth, from cunning hypocrisy and falsehood. Thus, for example, Aben Ezra, in commenting on this portion of Genesis, attempts to vindicate falsehood on occasion of necessity, (לצורך שעה) by appealing to David's declaration to Abimelech, "the vessels of the young men are holy," (1 Sam. xxi. 5;) to Elisha's message to the king of Syria, "go, say unto him, thou wilt certainly recover," (2 Kings viii. 10,) although his meaning is, as is afterwards expressed, "the Lord hath showed me that he shall surely die;" to Micaiah's language to Ahab, "go and prosper," (1 Kings xxii. 15;) to Daniel's address to Nebuchadnezzar, "my lord, the dream be to them that hate thee," (Dan. iv. 19.) And Rashi's comment, though brief, according to his manner, very evidently makes the language of Jacob an equivocation: "אנכי עשׂו' המביא לך ועשׂו' "

‘**הוא בכור**, I Esau :* who bring to thee, and Esau, he is thy first-born ;” that is, ‘I am bringing thee the food, and Esau is thy eldest son.’† And not only do Jews of the middle ages make these wretched efforts to remove their great ancestor’s criminality ; but a most distinguished Christian father of the fourth century labors with Jesuitical sophistry to free him and his mother from censure, and to represent their conduct as worthy of praise. The golden-mouthed patriarch of Constantinople employs the force of his eloquence to give weight to the opinion, which others before him had advanced, that, as the frauds in question did not proceed from any inclination to do mischief, but were subservient to the attainment of the highest good, the principals in conducting them are rather entitled to approbation than obnoxious to censure. Thus, in his fifty-third Homily on Genesis, (chap. xxvii.) Tom. IV. p. 515, of the Benedictine edition, he says : Ὅρα μητρὸς φιλοστοργίαν, μᾶλλον δὲ θεοῦ ἰκονομίαν· ἀπὸς γὰρ ἦν ὁ καὶ τάυτην πρὸς τὴν συμβουλὴν διεγείρων, καὶ τὸ πᾶν κατορθώσκειν ποιῶν. “See the greatness of the mother’s love, or rather the dispensation of God. For he it was who excited her to (give) the counsel, and who made the whole matter successful.” And afterwards he speaks of her acting ‘not from the impulse of her own opinion merely, but under a prompting from above,’ ἄνωθεν· and again, p. 516, of ‘her and Jacob doing what was proper (or necessary,

* These two words are the text, the comment follows.

† It is worthy of notice, that CARTWRIGHT, after rejecting the erroneous gloss of Rashi, and noting with disapprobation the attempt of Lyra to free Jacob from the charge of falsehood, by saying, that in office and dignity respecting the right of primogeniture, Jacob was Esau, does himself make the remark, that “if Jacob had only said, I am the first-born, he might perhaps be excusable : sane si tantum dixisset, ego sum primogenitus, excusari forsân potuisset ; et cum dixerit, ego sum Esau, frustra quæritur excusatio.” What views could these theologians have had of the nature of falsehood ?

ἐχρῆν) to be done, and of the most difficult part of all, the concealment of the fraud from Isaac, being effected by the good Lord's co-operation.' And then, as his hearer might well be supposed to ask whether God lent his aid to such a falsehood, he kindly cautions him 'not to be too inquisitive about the fact, but to attend to the design in view, which was not the acquisition of any temporal advantage, but the paternal benediction:' μή ἀπλῶς ἐξέταζε τὸ γινόμενον, ἀγαπητέ, ἀλλὰ τὸν σκοπὸν καταμύθανε, καὶ τα α.

It should never be forgotten, that the characters who stand out in such bold relief in the pages of sacred Scripture, are represented as men, weak and sinful like ourselves. The inspired historian does not indeed stop, in his narrative, to express any opinion respecting the moral character of the actions he records; but we are not on this account to suppose that he meant to justify them, any more than we should infer from a similar silence that the Evangelists did not condemn the act of crucifying our Lord. It was not the writer's object to comment on the character of the action; but rather to give a true picture of human nature, and to illustrate the divine influence in accomplishing God's schemes, notwithstanding the natural unfitness of the agency by means of which they were advanced. And yet the judgment of the author, and even the divine judgment, are readily discernible by the attentive reader in the history itself. The acquiescence of Abraham in the advice of Sarah, whereby he betrays a want of that implicit reliance on the divine promise by which he was generally characterized, is followed by consequences which for a time were fatal to his domestic peace. Jacob's conduct on the present occasion meets with its merited retribution in the treatment which he afterwards receives from Laban; and Rebecca, in that long and anxious separation from her favorite, which must in a good degree have embittered her life. And to this it may

be proper to add, that if the sacred writer relates these occurrences without any expression of censure, he sometimes stamps upon them the seal of his reprobation, when, in a subsequent part of his work, he has occasion to refer back to them. Of this we have a striking instance in the horror with which the dying Jacob regards the incestuous conduct of his eldest son, and the wanton cruelty of two of the others. See xlix. 4—7. The success which attended Rebecca's crafty project is no more an impeachment of the divine wisdom and goodness, than are many other results which the providence of God allows to crown the efforts of ambitious and selfish hypocrisy. All events of this kind do but confirm the truth, that human frailty and passion are made subservient to the divine will.

(108.) For the various meanings assigned to the word לִמְנוּחַי, see Rosenmüller and Dathe in loc., and particularly SCHROEDER, in his *Observationes ad Origines Hebræas*, cap. i, § 9. See also Gesenius under לִמְנוּחַי, No. 2.

(109.) Compare Note (57.)

(110.) The doctrine of a particular providence, extending on suitable occasions even so far as to miraculous influence, seems plainly intimated by the symbol of the ladder and the angels, and the allusion to it made by our Lord in reference to himself in John i. 51. The instruction and consolation thus afforded to Jacob could not have been conveyed by any more appropriate emblem. The notion, that the doctrine of angels, either good or bad, is of Babylonian or Persian origin, and was incorporated into Jewish theology after the captivity, is utterly irreconcilable with Scripture; and, if admitted, would destroy the credibility of the Old Testament history. Nothing can be clearer, than that the authors represent the patriarchs themselves, and the Hebrew

worthies in general, as believing in the existence of angels, and recognizing their influence in human affairs.

(111.) The erection of pillars for religious purposes, and anointing them with oil, is of high antiquity. They received the name of *βαῖνύλια*, probably from *בַּיִת-אֵל*, and are mentioned occasionally as animated stones. See CLEMENT of Alexandria, Strom. Lib. VII. p. 713, Sylburg's edition, and Sanconiathon in EUSEBIUS, Evang. Prep. Lib. I. cap. x. p. 37, Cologne edition, 1688. Jacob raises his pillar merely as commemorative; but the heathen paid to theirs a species of divine adoration. See Rosenmüller in loc., and particular his *Alte und Neue Morgenland*, Vol. I. p. 125—128.—The twentieth verse does not imply indecision in Jacob's purpose. Since God had promised to bless him, he vows obedience as an expression of his gratitude.

According to the Masoretical accentuation, which is followed by our English translation, the patriarch's vow commences with the latter clause of the twenty-first verse: "then shall the Lord be my God." And certainly the sense is good and clear; 'I will devote myself to the service of Jehovah,' in contradistinction to that of any false God. In the opinion of Hengstenberg, however, (*ubi sup.* p. 370, 371,) this clause precedes the commencement of the vow, thus: 'Since God will be with me, &c.—and Jehovah is my God; this stone, &c.' He argues in favor of this construction from the tense of *יְהוָה*, whereas the following verbs *יִהְיֶה* and *אֶעֱשֶׂה* are future in their form. This is of little moment, as the *vau* is conversive. But, to declare as part of a vow, that Jehovah should be one's God, that the benefitted party would accept him as protector and Lord, is not accordant with scriptural usage, which always, as the author says, embodies the grateful feeling in some outward action. Besides, the thirteenth verse seems to confirm this construc-

tion: "I am the God of Abraham, thy father, and the God of Isaac." This illustrates the language of Jacob: 'since Jehovah is to me what he declared himself to have been to Abraham and Isaac;' and it is confirmed by the declaration in the fifteenth verse, "I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again to this land." The last clause, 'and Jehovah is my God,' concentrates, as it were, all that the holy man had just said, implying guidance, protection, security, and happy restoration to the promised land, and the paternal home.

(112.) MICHAELIS supposes that Jacob received Leah at the commencement of the seven stipulated years, and that the chronology requires this admission. USHER, in his chronology, and JUNIUS and TREMELLIUS in their note on this place, maintain the same opinion. So also RICHARDSON, Bishop of Ardagh, in his very useful "Observations upon the Book of Genesis," London, 1655, on v. 20. But the language of the twenty-first verse is evidently unfavorable to this view. It is very harsh to render **מִלְאֵי יָמַי**, as the last mentioned author does, "my days are filled or filling up," that is, I am advancing in age; or, with the first, 'I am quite marriageable, and can no longer defer making such a connexion, unless I forego the hope of having a family.' Whatever Jacob's age may have been at this time, we know he must have lived fifty years beyond it, when he was presented to Pharaoh, (compare xlvii. 9, with xlv. 6, xli. 47, 46, xxxi. 41, and xxx. 25 ss.) and it is evident, that neither his age nor constitution and habits correspond with such a construction. Besides, the Hebrew will not bear it. The ordinary phrase to express advanced age is, **זָקֵן בָּא בַּיָּמִים**. See Josh. xiii. 1, xxiii. 2, 1 Kings i. 1, and a similar form in 1 Sam. xii. 2. **מִלְאֵי**, when used in con-

nexion with time, means ‘to fill up, expire, complete,’ designating accomplishment or end, never advancement or progress. Thus 1 Sam. xviii. 26, “the days were not expired, **בְּלֹאֵי**,” that is, the time appointed had not come to an end; Levit. xii. 4, “until the days of her purifying have expired **עַד-בְּלֹאֵת** ;” xxv. 30, “until the expiration **עַד-בְּלֹאֵת** of a full year ;” Num. vi. 5, 13; Jer. xxv. 34, “for your days—are accomplished,” or expired, **כִּי-בְּלֹאֵי יָמֵיכֶם** ; also xxix. 10; Dan. x. 3. There are no exceptions to this meaning. In Jer. vi. 11, “the aged with **בְּלֵאָה יָמָיו**” signifies ‘with him who has accomplished his days,’ as we would say, is just expiring, not him who is advancing in age; so also Lam. iv. 18. In 2 Sam. vii. 12, and the parallel place 1 Chron. xvii. 11, the phrase “when thy days be fulfilled” or “expired” means, ‘when thy life is ended,’ as the words immediately following prove. The view given by Michaelis and Richardson is not supported by usage. The chronological difficulties alluded to must therefore be removed in some other way.

(113.) The term “hated” in v. 31 is comparative, implying very inferior regard, as the preceding verse intimates; and in this sense it is often used in Scripture. See Luke xiv. 26: “if any man come to me and hate not his father, &c.”; Rom. ix. 13, compared with Mal. i. 3: “Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated;” and Deut. xxi. 15—17: “if a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated.”

(114.) Reuben, **רְאוּבֵן**, means literally, ‘see a son;’ but the former part of the name is not the ordinary word for ‘see, behold,’ (although it is occasionally so used, as in xxxix. 14,) which is **הִיטָה**, and the context shows that it alludes to the Lord’s having seen the mother’s affliction. When the

slighted and mortified Leah became the mother of a son, she cried out, under a feeling of the triumph which, (according to the spirit of the time and people,) she supposed herself to have gained, “see, a son!” and this name she imposes on the infant, as a lasting monument of her own honor and a disgrace to her competitor for the husband’s favor: “for she said, surely the Lord hath looked upon my affliction, בִּירְאָה יְהוָה בְּעֵנָי. In those words, she does not refer to the name Reuben, the derivation and meaning of which are clear enough of themselves, but to the fact of her being permitted to make the declaration, to the painful reminiscences which were connected with the name. Her language contains a paronomasia, and adheres as closely as possible to the origin of the former part of the word and the sound of the latter. Any other connexion of the words is not to be thought of.

Thus, for substance, Drechsler, *ubi sup.* p. 212, 213. He proceeds to add: ‘How ridiculously pedantic, then, for lexicographers of the nineteenth century seriously to examine whether Leah’s words are consistent with conjugation and declension.’ No doubt he alludes to Gesenius, who, under the word רְאִיבֶן, remarks as follows: “See ye, a son! although the author of Genesis, in xxix. 32, seems to explain the name as being for בְּעֵנָי [רְאִי] provided for my affliction.” The language of the critic will hardly be considered too caustic, when we reflect that the lexicographer’s remark seems to imply ignorance on the part of the Hebrew author himself.

Simeon, שִׁמְעוֹן, is from שָׁמַע ‘to hear;’ and it implies Leah’s domestic calamity, and also her belief that the Lord had not forgotten her. Levi, לֵוִי, from לָוָה ‘to join,’ denotes the union of heart which the tried, yet happy mother hopes may result. Judah, יְהוּדָה, from יָדָה in Hiphil, ‘to praise,

expresses her gratitude to God, in which every other consideration seems to be absorbed.

(115.) Dan is derived from the root דָּן, 'to judge,' meaning, to espouse the cause of, as where God is said to "judge his people;" and where it is commanded to "judge the fatherless." See Heb. x. 30, Deut. xxxii. 36, Isa. i. 17.—Naphthali is a word formed from the root נָתַל, 'to strive, wrestle,' implying that she had used all her efforts to equal her sister, and had succeeded.

(116.) The word בָּרַךְ, according to the reading in the margin בָּרַךְ בָּא, means 'good fortune comes;' according to that in the text, with a slight change in the punctuation of the first letter, it signifies, 'with good fortune,' that is, 'happily, auspiciously,' ἐν εὐτυχίᾳ, as it is in the Septuagint. The sense of "troop" is unsupported. In Gen. xlix. 19, the similarity of בָּרַךְ and בָּרַכְךָ is the sole ground of the alliteration. Compare v. 29.—In the thirteenth verse, our translators have followed the Septuagint, μαχαρία ἐγὼ the literal version of the Hebrew is, 'with,' or 'for my happiness'; that is, the birth of this son will contribute to it.

(117.) וְשָׂכָר or וְשִׁכָּר is probably contracted from וְשָׂא שִׁכָּר, 'will bring hire.'

(118.) The paronomasia is a favorite figure with the Hebrews, and may often be traced in the application of names. And if this play upon a word comprehends an allusion to more ideas than one, it is considered as so much the more spirited. Hence it is that Rachel, at the birth of her first son, applies the term Joseph in a two-fold respect; in part, as she connects with him the wish, that the Lord *may add*

yet one more, (יֹסֶף יִהְיֶה לִּי בֶן אֲחֵר) xxx. 24, and in part, as she combines יֹסֶף with אָסַף in the former verse, “God *hath taken away* my reproach.” The reader who examines the two verses carefully, will see that neither of them can be removed without injuring the sense, which requires the ideas conveyed by both to be combined.

The combination in the latter clause of v. 20 is of a still freer kind. Leah calls her son Zebulon, in order to bring in a paronomasia of זָבַל to dwell with, and זָבַד to endow. See the former part of the verse.

(119.) “Ten times ;” that is, often, a definite for an indefinite number. See Num. xiv. 22.—The Septuagint has *ἐννέα δέκα ἀμυνών*, for an explanation of which see Schleusner’s *Lexicon in Septuaginta* under *ἀμυνος*.

(120.) As the latter part of v. 13, “now arise, &c.” cannot be a direction given to Jacob at the time of the dream just mentioned, v. 10, &c., it is probable, that it is a repetition, made by Jacob to his wives, of that mentioned in the third verse.

Perhaps it may be thought by some readers, that the subject of this dream of Jacob is of such a nature, as to be inconsistent with the supposition of a divine communication. To remove the difficulty, it has been said, that the whole occurrence is nothing but a dream ; that Jacob’s mind, dwelling on Laban’s unworthy attempts to injure him, naturally revolved the matter even in sleep ; that the stratagem thus occurring to him in the ordinary progress of thought, while in this state, is ascribed by him to God’s angel, on the cherished supposition, that whatever tended to his welfare originated with that divine being to whose service he had devoted himself ; or else, on another principle, that

whatever is allowed in the providence of God is, in scriptural language, ascribed to God himself. Although the principle and supposition are both true; and, although it should be granted, that the waking emotions of Jacob might have suggested to his mind while asleep such an idea as the narrative conveys; the interpretation offered by this view of the matter cannot be admitted. Any other view than that of a divine communication in the ordinary sense of the words, is inconsistent with the language of the text. The natural thoughts of the mind, whether the party be awake or asleep, are never expressed in language like this: "and the angel of God spake unto me, &c.;" while, on the other hand, this language is entirely analogous to that elsewhere employed to denote divine communications. These are sometimes ascribed to God, sometimes to the Lord, and sometimes to the angel of God or of the Lord. It cannot then be denied, that such a communication is here intended. Neither, indeed, is the nature of it inconsistent with this belief. It is no more derogatory to the purity and dignity of the divine being, to admit that he made such a communication in an extraordinary way, in order to effect one part of his great scheme by increasing the wealth and reputation of the patriarch, than it would be to admit that Providence allowed him, by a close observation of nature, to perceive the bearing and influence of external circumstances in producing such a result as the narrative mentions. The operations of nature are the effects of the laws which the God of nature has imposed on his works; and it cannot possibly be inconsistent with the purity and dignity of the lawgiver, to allow that he may disclose those laws in any method most agreeable to him, whenever, in his wisdom, important ends are thereby to be answered.

(121.) Some commentators remark that Laban ought to

have allowed his two daughters the value of Jacob's fourteen years' service as their dowry. The ordinary usage seems to have been, for the son-in-law to give a dowry to the father. See xxxiv. 12, 1 Sam. xviii. 23, 25, 27. It is said, however, that occasionally the father paid one. See JANN'S *Archæology*, § 153. The language of Laban's daughters is quite explicable on the ground of their father's contemptible and unnatural behaviour.

(122.) For an account of these images, see the commentators, particularly Drusius, (in the *Critici Sacri*,) on v. 19, *notæ majores*, and De Muis: also, Calmet's *Dictionary* under the word. He gives a view of the absurd notions of some of the Jewish rabbins on the nature and uses of the *teraphim*; and Buxtorf, in his *Talmudic Lexicon*, (col. 2660—4,) quotes largely from these writers. The *teraphim* were probably a sort of household gods, stolen by Rachel from superstitious and perhaps idolatrous motives. Compare xxxv. 2, 4.

(123.) *Jegar sahadutha* is Syriac, and of the same import as *Galeed* in Hebrew, that is, 'heap of witness,' heap which attests. Parkhurst under יגר contends, that the former words are Hebrew, meaning, "may the witness of the appointed bounds (be) a terror (to us.);" He follows JULIUS BATE'S *New and Literal Translation*. Compare his *Critica Hebræa*, or *Hebrew and English Dictionary*, under שדה. But the form of the words allows no such signification. They are pure Syriac, exactly equivalent to the Hebrew used by Jacob. Mizpah, the other name, means 'watch-tower.' See the *Lexicons*.—In v. 53, the clause, "the God of their father," is probably the parenthetical remark of the author. This is the opinion of Aben Ezra, in which Rosen-

müller acquiesces. Considered as the language of Laban, it embarrasses the sentence.

(124.) The notion of De Wette and some other German rationalists, that this narrative is a historical mythus, that is, a fiction, invented to give a reason for the name Mahanaim, which occurs in Jos. xx. 38, is unworthy of serious refutation. Why should a reason of this sort be devised to account for this particular name, while a multitude of others equally significant and important, are unaccounted for?

(125.) Septuagint: ὅτι ἐνίσχυσας μετὰ θεῶν, καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατὸς ἔσῃ. Vulgate: quoniam si contra Deum fortis fuisti, quanto majis contra homines prævalebis. Rosenmüller remarks after Le Clerc, that שָׁרָה never has the sense of strength or victory. That may be, and yet the idea may be implied from the circumstances in which the word is used: יָשַׁב means to dwell, and yet it sometimes implies the idea of *security*; קָלַח means to fight, but in 2 Kings xvi. 5, and Isa. vii. 1, it expresses *prevailing* in war. The English translation of שָׁרָה “as a prince hast thou power,” combines the meaning of the verb with that of שָׂר a prince, following the Chaldee Targum, which has, “for a prince art thou before Jehovah.” JEROME also, in his Questions on Genesis, Tom. II. Col. 536, Paris. 1699, (or as cited by Drusius in loc.) gives the same view. There may be an intended allusion to the meaning of שָׂר, but this is by no means necessary or certain. The sense suggested by the Septuagint and Vulgate versions, is probably the true one: ‘thou hast prevailed (contended successfully) with God, much more shalt thou be mighty against men.’ The term Israel is therefore expressive of extraordinary distinction in opposi-

tion to that of Jacob, a supplanter. See Hos. xii. 3, 4; 1 Kings xviii. 31; 2 Kings xvii. 34.

(126.) The word הִקַּט in v. 26, is rendered in our translation, "was out of joint." Inasmuch, however, as this is the only place in which it is supposed to have this meaning, which seems also to be hardly compatible with the circumstances of the case, I cannot but doubt the correctness of the version. The idea of being contracted, drawn away, hanging loose from, the cavity of the thigh, suits the context, and is in analogy with the signification in which the word is elsewhere used. It occurs but nine times, in addition to the text: in Kal and Niphal in Jer. vi. 8, Ezek. xxiii. 17, 18, 22, 28; and in Hiphil and Hophal in Num. xxv. 4, 2 Sam. xxi. 6, 9, 13. In all these texts, it has the sense of being alienated from, or of hanging.—On the Jewish usage to abstain from the part referred to, the Talmud contains several precepts. See the Treatise הורלין, on profane things, chap. vii. Mishna, edition of Surenhusius, Part V. p. 140—142.

(127.) The word "blessing" in v. 11, is equivalent to "present" in v. 10, and is often used in this sense. See 1 Sam. xxv. 27.

(128.) By comparing v. 12 and 14, it seems that Esau invited Jacob to accompany him to Seir. Whether Jacob intended to follow his brother there, and was afterwards induced to change his mind, and whether, at any subsequent period, he went or not, we are not informed. The difficulties which must have impeded the further migration of so numerous a family, with all that belonged to them, and especially the divine direction to return to Canaan, (xxxi. 13.)

are sufficient to account for his avoiding such a journey, without supposing that he still apprehended hostility on the part of his brother.

(129.) Interpreters, both ancient and modern, differ in translating the first clause of the eighteenth verse. The Targum and other highly respectable authorities, consider the word “shalem” as an adjective, meaning *safe* (or *safely*), as it is used in Nahum i. 12, analogous to its ordinary sense of *sound*, *perfect*. So Dathe, Augusti, Rosenmüller, and Gesenius. Thus it may refer to the recovery of Jacob’s thigh, to the safety of his family and property, and, in general, to his deliverance from the various dangers to which he had been exposed. “שָׁלֵם: sound in his body, which had recovered of its halting; sound in his property, which had not diminished; sound in his religion, which he had not neglected during his residence with Laban.” Rashi. “שָׁלֵם is an adjective; and the meaning is, that he came safe, that no unfortunate event had occurred to him: for he had not yet recorded the affair of Dinah.” Aben Ezra. Drechsler supposes also a reference to the language of Jacob’s conditional vow in xxviii. 21. “Here,” says he, “is a great point in the patriarch’s life. The dark hours of foreign pilgrimage and service are succeeded by the bright day of gloriously accomplished promise. He had said, “so that I come again to my father’s house in peace, בְּשָׁלוֹם; now he comes שָׁלֵם to Sichem.” p. 147. But if such a reference were intended, I should suppose that the same word would have been employed in both places.—Others again, following the Septuagint and Vulgate, explain the word as the name of the city in the vicinity of which he settled. Thus our English translation, and also the German of Luther. I am strongly disposed to believe that this is right; other-

wise the name of the city is not designated, and such an omission is unusual. Shechem is the name of the man who makes so prominent a figure in the subsequent chapter. This is proved by the next verse, and the repeated use of the word in the narrative which immediately follows; although it is true that there was a place which bore the same name. See xxxvii. 12 ss. The translation in the Septuagint is, Shalem, a city of the Sichemites, *πόλις Σιχιμιωτων*, and that of the Vulgate, urbem Sichemorum. Rosenmüller's and Dathe's "venit Sichemum," "pervenit Sichemum," (meaning the city Sichem,) are inadmissible; as, in such cases, the usage requires the article before the word *city*, as in Esther iii. 15, and viii. 15, *הָעִיר שִׁיכֶם*. In the text it is simply *עִיר שִׁיכֶם* without the article, and I think it ought not to be rendered 'the city Shechem,' but, 'a city of Shechem,' or 'Shechem's city,' that is, a place under the government of this person, who is immediately afterwards called "the prince of the country," xxxiv. 2. This, I believe, agrees with the invariable usage. Thus we have in Num. xxi. 28, *מִקְרֵיית סִיחֹן* from *Sihon's city*; and in Samuel and Chronicles, *David's city* is always *עִיר דָּוִד* or *דָּוִדִּיר*, never *הָעִיר*. If, therefore, Shalem is not the name of a place, no city is specified; unless, indeed, the phrase 'Shechem's city' were in the author's age sufficiently definite for this purpose. As this may be so, I have thought it best to retain the expression *safely*, in the Analysis. Whether this is implied in the original word or not, it is no doubt implied in the narration.

I find, after writing this note, that Mendelsohn's translation is: "Jacob came safely to Shechem's city."

(130.) The literal translation of the last clause is: 'and he called it God, the God of Israel.' Such names, applied to places, occur elsewhere. See the last words in Ezekiel, and also Jer. xxxiii. 16, (ad fin.) which cannot be proved to

relate to any other object than Jerusalem. It is as if the patriarch had said, 'I have experienced that God is the God of Israel, and this altar I erect as a memorial of his mercies. Gratitude compels the avowal.' The name of God is applied to the object whereby or wherein he is honored. Still, there may be an ellipsis of altar; or **לְיְהוָה** may be understood in a genitive sense, and the meaning be: 'he called it God's,' the next words being explanatory. The Septuagint, ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ, 'he invoked the God of Israel,' and the Vulgate, invocavit super illud fortissimum Deum Israelis, do not accord with the Hebrew. The former omits any notice of the words **לְיְהוָה**, and the latter gives to **לְיְהוָה** the sense of 'invoking upon,' while its ordinary meaning is *to name*, as in Gen. i. 5, 7, and in many other places.

(131.) The phrase, "to work folly in (or, against) Israel, **בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל**," is thought by some to be of later origin than that period in which the book of Genesis is supposed to have been written. It occurs in Josh. vii. 15, Judg. xx. 10. But, although in these places Israel is used for the nation, the phrase may have originated from the very text before us. The language is not indicative of a later age than that of the patriarch himself.

(132.) While the cruel and crafty plot of Jacob's sons deserves the severest reprobation, it is evident, and especially from v. 23, that the Shechemites also acted with duplicity and from interested motives. They were overreached by the superior management of their enemies.

(133.) The expression, "terror of God," in v. 5, is considered by some as a Hebraism, for 'great terror,' as in xxiii. 6, 'a prince of God,' for "a mighty prince," and xxx.

8, 'wrestlings of God,' for "great wrestlings," and elsewhere. Inasmuch, however, as an extraordinary providence often superintended and controlled the affairs of the patriarchs and their families, the view suggested in the Analysis is preferable. Compare Exod. xxiii. 27: "I will send my fear before thee."

(134.) Compare xxxiii. 20, which is probably parallel. Thus the meaning will be: 'he called the place, God of Bethel.'—Another view is admissible: 'he called the place of God,' (that is, the place consecrated to God,) 'Bethel'; or, 'he called the place, God's, Bethel.' Thus the last words, meaning 'God's house,' will be explanatory.

(135.) The space denoted by the original word בְּרָחָה cannot be determined. From the etymology, it would seem to imply a considerable distance: but this must, of course, be relative. In 2 Kings v. 19, the distance which it denotes could not have been great. See Gesenius under the word, SCHLEUSNER'S Thesaurus Veteris Testamenti, under χαβραθα and ἱππόδρομος.

(136.) The name Benjamin, בִּנְיָמִין, is thought by several commentators to mean, 'son of old age,' יָמִין being taken as the Chaldee form, for 'days.' But the evident antithesis between Benoni, 'son of my sorrow,' and Benjamin, shows that the latter must denote excellence or happiness of some kind. The parallelism in Ps. lxxx. 18, (17,) suggests the idea of strength, and this is probably what the name implies, as the right hand is more vigorous and efficient than the left.

(137.) As all Jacob's children, except Benjamin, were

born in Mesopotamia, the historian does not think it necessary to mention this one in particular. His language is popular rather than exact. Thus in 1 Cor. xv. 5, it is said, that Christ appeared "to the twelve," although the suicide of Judas had reduced the number of the apostles to eleven; and in Luke xxiv. 33, "the eleven" are said to have been "gathered together," although we are elsewhere informed that Thomas was not one of their number. See John xxi. 24, where again the expression is, "one of the twelve." All this is popular language. The Scripture abounds with it, and the failure to recognize it has been a prolific source of mistakes and difficulties.

PART X. CHAP. XXXVI.

(138.) On comparing xxvi. 34, with the second verse of this chapter, a seeming discrepancy appears. To solve it the conjecture has been advanced, that, the names designate different persons, thus: (1) Judith; (2) Bashemath, the daughter of Elon; (3) Adah, another daughter of Elon. The supposition of Le Clerc, that the latter of these names was applied by Isaac and Rebecca to Bashemath, in reference to her character and conduct, this meaning being drawn from the Arabic عَدَا, to transgress, act wickedly, is quite improbable. (4) Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah; (5) Bashemath, the daughter of Ishmael; and (6) Mahalath, her sister, (xxviii. 9.) According to this view, six wives of Esau will be mentioned.

Another theory removes the difficulty, by supposing that each of these women appears under two names, thus reducing the number of his wives to three. Hengstenberg adopts this course. See his *Authentic des Pentateuches*, II. p. 273 ss. He identifies the Anah of xxxvi. 2, 24, with Beer

of xxvi. 34, who derived his name בְּעֹרִי, equivalent to 'well' or 'spring finder,' from the discovery of warm springs mentioned in xxxvi. 24. This is now generally acknowledged by critics to be the most probable meaning of בְּעֹרִי, which is rendered in our translation, "mules." This man, who in xxxvi. 2, is called a Hivite, is named a Horite in v. 20; that is, he belonged to that subdivision of the Canaanitish race of the Hivites, who, from their residence in caves, were known as Horites or Troglodytes, from the Hebrew and Greek words respectively. In xxvi. 34, the same person, if Hengstenberg's theory is correct, is called a Hittite. This discrepancy he removes by showing that the term Hittite, although it originally designated a single Canaanitish tribe, was, like the name Amorite, employed in a broader sense, to denote the whole race. Thus in Josh. i. 4, "the land of the Hittites" comprehended all the country of the Canaanites; in 1 Kings x. 29, we read of "all the kings of the Hittites;" and in 2 Kings vii. 6, "the king of Israel" is said to have "hired the kings of the Hittites." With this view the language in Ezek. xvi. 3, corresponds: "thy father was an Amorite and thy mother a Hittite." So in Gen. xxvii. 46, xxviii. 1, the Hittite women are put for Canaanitish women in general. Hence it is clear, that the same individual might be a Hivite and a Hittite. He conjectures that all the wives of Esau received new names at their marriage, when they left their families, by which names they are designated in xxxvi; Judith (xxvi. 34,) is Aholibamah, Bashemath is Adah, and Mahalath (xxviii. 9,) is Bashemath. How closely new circumstances and new names are connected in the east, is well known; and this is particularly true of females. See p. 277.

If neither of those solutions should be thought altogether satisfactory, we cannot be surprised, much less charge the

author with contradiction, if we consider the great antiquity of the matter, the absence of all other data than those contained in the Bible, the want of analogy with modern and occidental usages which marked the ancient state of things, and the want of importance as regards ourselves of the whole subject.

(139.) The original is **וְלִבְיָנִי**. The phrase “into the country,” which is used in the English translation, does not convey the meaning, and indeed, in the circumstances in which the two brothers then were, it is hardly explicable. It would in itself seem to imply, that before they had been together in some city, which is surely unfounded and improbable.

(140.) This portion contains more than one inscription. That in v. 1 is general, and intended for the whole chapter. In v. 5, we have a subscription, referring back to Esau’s sons born in Canaan. The remainder of the chapter is introduced by v. 9; and the different clauses of it by their own appropriate inscriptions. All, however, is perfectly natural, and not a trace of a disjointed or fragmentary composition is discoverable.

(141.) It appears that v. 15—18 give the list of dukes (**אֲלֵפִים**) through whom the Idumean nation originated from Esau, and who were themselves founders of as many lines; while, on the other hand, v. 40—43 specify those who flourished in the time of Moses: so that we are here furnished with the condition of the Idumean people, as they were divided into tribes in the time of Moses, in the reign of the last named eighth king Hadar, or Hadad, as he is

called in the first book of Chronicles. The early condition of Edom's national existence was one of division. This will be evident to any who attentively examine the list here given of its kings, which does not afford a single instance of regular succession from father to son. We may therefore infer without hesitation, that the political condition of the people was the very opposite of stability. And this is not at all surprising, as the immediately preceding period, during which the old inhabitants of the country were driven out or subjected, must have been one of violence. This view of the subject is derived in part from the expressions in v. 40—43. The particular importance of the second list of dukes here exhibited, and its specific distinctions from the one before given, appear in the recurring adjuncts: "these are the dukes of Esau according to their families, *according to their places, according to their names,*" v. 40; or, "*according to their habitations in the land of their possession,*" v. 43. These adjuncts plainly denote, that, while the former list, 15—18, gives merely the genealogical and individual designation, this one has in view a geographical division of the race. This same view is confirmed by 1 Chron. i. 51. There it is said, "Hadad died also, and *then* (וְאַתָּה) the dukes of Edom were, &c." Thus the Idumean dukes are represented in the Chronicles and in Genesis in connexion with Hadad. The death of this king is mentioned in Chronicles, but not by Moses, as is that of the seven who preceded him. Now, if the period of Hadad's government coincides with that of Moses, (as is here supposed to be the case,) this peculiarity in the narrative is explained. And, on this theory, the fact that the wife of the eighth king is the only one mentioned by name, (Gen. xxxvi. 39,) is also susceptible of explanation.

Further, it is clear from this chapter, that among the Idu-

means, kings and dukes were contemporaneous. This statement is in harmony with Ex. xv. 15, "the *dukes* of Edom shall be amazed," and Num. xx. 14, "Moses sent messengers unto the *king* of Edom."

The connexion of this chapter with the preceding and subsequent ones, is worthy of notice. As the section xxv. 12—18, which treats of Ishmael, the collateral branch, refers backwards to the history of Abraham, (xii. 1—xxv. 11,) which concludes with xxv. 1—11, and forwards to the history of Isaac, (xxv. 19—xxxv. 29,) which begins with xxv. 19; so does the section, chapter xxxvi., relate to the preceding chapter, which contains a brief notice of Isaac, and also to the following, which keeps in view the story of Jacob. The identity of the author, and the fact of his being governed by a regular plan, are manifestly deducible from such premises. And this will be still more evident, if we compare xxxv. 23—26 with xxv. 1—6, and xxxv. 27—29 with xxv. 7—9, and the manner in which xxv. 19 and xxxvii. 2 begin. In order to assist the reader in making this comparison, I shall exhibit the places respectively in parallel columns.

xxxv. 23—26. "The sons of Leah; Reuben, Jacob's first-born, and Simeon, and Levi, and Judah, and Issachar, and Zebulun.

The sons of Rachel; Joseph, and Benjamin.

And the sons of Bilhah, Rachel's handmaid; Dan and Naphthali.

And the sons of Zilpah, Leah's handmaid; Gad and Asher. These are the sons of Jacob, &c."

xxv. 1—6. "Then again Abraham took a wife, &c.

And she bare him Zimran and Jokshan, and Medan, and Midian, and Ishbak, and Shuah.

And Jokshan begat Sheba, and Dedan. And the sons of Dedan were, &c.

And the sons of Midian, Ephah, and Epher, &c. All these were the children of Keturah.

And Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac.

But unto the sons of the concubines, &c."

xxxv. 27—29. "And Jacob came unto Isaac his father unto Mamre, unto the city of Arbah, which is Hebron, where Abraham and Isaac sojourned.

And the days of Isaac were an hundred and fourscore years.

And Isaac gave up the ghost, and died, and was gathered unto his people, being old and full of days; and his sons Esau and Jacob buried him."

(xxxvi. Generations of Esau.)

xxxvii. 2. "These are the generations of Jacob. Joseph, being seventeen years old, &c."

xxv. 7—9. "And these are the days of the years of Abraham's life which he lived, an hundred threescore and fifteen years.

And Abraham gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age, an old man and full of years, and was gathered to his people.

And his sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him in the cave, &c."

(xxv. 12—18. Generations of Ishmael.)

xxv. 19, 20. "And these are the generations of Isaac, Abraham's son. Abraham begat Isaac.

And Isaac was forty years old, &c."

Now this is the arrangement, and ordinarily the method which pervades the whole book of Genesis, as the attentive reader will readily perceive. For the thirty-sixth chapter stands between the thirty-fifth and thirty-seventh, just as the notice of Cain, in chapter iv., stands between the account of Adam in ii., iii., and the introduction of Seth and his genealogy in chapter v.; and further also, as chapter x. between the history of Noah in v. 32—ix. 29, and the genealogy of Shem in xi. 10 ss.; and lastly, as Ishmael is introduced between Abraham and Isaac in xxv. 12—18.

Another remark in connexion with this subject is worthy of notice. The way and manner in which the portion of the historical accounts of the patriarchs which immediately follows chapter xxxvi., (that is, xxxvii. 1, 2,) is introduced, manifestly refers back to that chapter. In other words, xxxvii. 1, "and Jacob dwelt in the land where his father was a stranger, in the land of Canaan," and xxxvi. 8, "thus dwelt Esau in Mount Sein," are analogous. That Jacob, the heir of the promise, remained in the land of promise,

while Esau, the collateral branch of the family, was excluded, is here, as every where else, the principal point. Both xxxvii. 2, therefore, and xxxvi. 9, are similarly connected with the verses immediately preceding them.

The views given in this note are chiefly taken from the work of Drechsler before mentioned, p. 157 ss. Hengstenberg, II. p. 291 ss., accords in general with this writer. I shall give the reader a very brief analysis of his remarks.

‘The chapter begins with an account of Esau’s family during their residence in Canaan, and of their wealth and removal, 1—8. It proceeds to give a general view of the domestic condition of Esau in the country of Seir, 9—14. This is followed by the names of the tribes of the Edomites, who, like those of the Israelites, borrowed their names from those of Esau’s nearest descendants, and each of whom had its head or duke, in Hebrew alluph, as the alluph of the tribe of Teman, &c. 15—19. Afterwards appears the genealogy of Seir the Horite, 20—30. Then we have the Edomitish kings, 31—39. And the chapter closes by giving the residences of the chiefs of the Edomitish tribes, 40—43.’ This general view removes the chief difficulties in the chapter. The fourteen alluphim who are named (15—19) before the kings, do not form a successive course, but are contemporaneous, and, after the kings, it is not a new course of phylarchs that is given, but the residences of those before named. (He thinks it improbable that feminine nouns, such as Timnah, and Aholibamah, should denote the dukes themselves; and for this reason, and also an account of the adjuncts, “according to their families, after their places,” conjectures that the names employed designate the settlements of the personages. But it is unreasonable to suppose that the same language, which in v. 15—19 designates individuals, should in 40—43 be used of their local settlements.)

‘Every difficulty vanishes, when it is considered, that the royal power among the Edomites was not raised on the ruins of the authority of the phylarchs, (which would require a considerable course of time for the continuance of the latter, after the expiration of which the course of eight kings might begin,) but that both existed contemporaneously, the Edomites having rulers of tribes and also kings at the same time.’

‘The eighth king of the Edomites was evidently contemporaneous with the author of the Pentateuch; who mentions the decease of all the preceding kings, but is silent respecting his. The reason is plain: he was king when the author wrote. In the first book of Chronicles, indeed, his death is stated, ii. 51; but this work was composed long after his time. The author of Genesis, with a particularity which appears only in this individual case, mentions the names of his wife, her parent and grand-parent. What reason can be assigned for this, unless the author was contemporary with the Edomitish king? And the period of his reign falls within the age of Moses.’

From what has been said, it appears that the dukes and kings of Edom mentioned in this chapter may have flourished before the death of Moses, and consequently the notice here contained may have been written by him. Inasmuch as he does speak of kings who should rule over the Hebrews, (see Deut. xvii. 14—20, xxviii. 36,) it is not impossible that he may have written even the latter clause of v. 31,—“before there reigned any king over the children of Israel,” particularly as in xxxv. 11, he recounts the promise of God to Jacob, that “kings” should descend from him. Still it may have been originally a marginal note, which in time found its way into the text. Several commentators have supposed that the last thirteen verses of the chapter cannot have been the work of the Hebrew lawgiver. The reader

may find a notice of the most important writers on both sides of this question in Rosenmüller's *Scholia*, p. 555—558.

In v. 2, the phraseology, "Aholibamah the daughter of Anah, the daughter of Zibeon," is unusual and difficult. It is certain from v. 24, (compare also 1 Chron. i. 40,) that Anah was a male, and that he was Zibeon's son; unless, indeed, it be allowed that Zibeon had a son and daughter bearing the same name, which is very improbable. From v. 25 it appears that this Anah was Aholibamah's father. To remove the supposed difficulty, Dathe and Rosenmüller would read בן for בת, son for daughter, following the Samaritan text and the Septuagint and Syriac versions. But Michaelis, who was once of the same opinion, objects that the same mode of expression occurs in v. 14, 39: to which may be added 1 Chron. i. 50.—Perhaps this method of recounting was used among the Idumeans, and the meaning of the clause in v. 2 may be this: "Aholibamah the daughter of Anah, (and) the daughter," that is, grand-daughter, "of Zibeon."—In v. 25, the noun *Anah* is used for the pronoun *his*, as is usual in Hebrew. See the same idiom in xi. 29, "the father of Milcah" for 'her father.'

PART XI. CHAP. XXXVII. 1—L.

(142.) xxxvii. 2. "These are the generations," or rather, 'this is an account of Jacob,' that is, of his family; the patriarch, as head, standing for his whole household. The inscription marks the epoch of a new ancestral lord,* as in xxv. 19, 'this is an account of Isaac.' In the one case, because Isaac was the successor of Abraham, and in the other, because Jacob was the son and heir of Isaac; the deaths of both having been previously mentioned, Abraham's in xx

* Drechsler, p. 139.

10, and Isaac's in xxxv. 29. As the chapter immediately following, (xxxvi.) relates to Esau, so the portion which succeeds the notice of Abraham's death, (xxv. 12—18,) relates to Ishmael. The construction and arrangement of both accounts are decidedly in favor of the opinion that both originated with the same author, and unfavorable to the theory, that each biographical narrative is founded on an independent document.

As the inscription marks the accession of a new chief, in the patriarchal line, and follows the account of the death of a predecessor, we need not be surprised that the inscription in xxxvii. 2, purporting to be an account of Jacob, is immediately succeeded by a part of the history of Joseph.

(143.) In v. 9, the article before the word "eleven" is not sanctioned by the Hebrew. If omitted, the meaning will be clearer.—As Joseph's own mother was dead, (compare xxxv. 18, and xxx. 22—24,) perhaps Bilhah may be meant, or Leah, if she still lived. But this supposition is by no means necessary, as the fact of Rachel's death heightens the absurdity of what seems to be implied in the dream.

(144.) The Ishmaelites and Midianites were both descended from Abraham, but of different female parentage. See xxv. 2, 4, 12—18. In this part of the narrative they appear to be identified, owing probably to their intimate association with each other. See also Judg. vii. 12, viii. 22, 24, 26, where the words seem to be used promiscuously. Rosenmüller distinguishes them as genus and species, illustrating by the comparison, taken from Aben Esra, of Frenchmen and Lyonnese. As the Ishmaelites were the most numerous and powerful of Abraham's descendants, (with the exception of the Israelites,) all the others seem to have become merged in them, and to have been known by their

name; as, in the present day, the Arabians boast of being the posterity of Ishmael.

(145.) Some weighty chronological difficulties arise from the account in this chapter. Certain of the events related in it must have taken place before the sale of Joseph. For, from this time until Jacob's descent into Egypt, not more than twenty-two years elapsed, (see xxxvii. 2, xli. 46, and to the thirteen years thus obtained, add the seven of plenty and two of famine which had passed by, xlv. 11,) which is too short a period for Judah to have three sons by the same mother, to marry them, and by his daughter-in-law to have twins, one of whom, Pharez, when he went to Egypt, had also two, xlv. 12. On the other hand, if Judah's incest with Tamar happened about the time of Joseph's sale, and the story be allowed to be properly placed here, this will carry up the circumstance of xxxviii. 1, 2, to the time when Jacob was in Mesopotamia. For, if we allow fourteen years (which is little enough, and in all probability too little,) for Shelah to be grown up, (xxxviii. 11, 14,) and three for the births of himself and two brothers, (v. 3—5,) this will make about seventeen between the conduct of Judah mentioned in v. 16 ss., and his associating with Shuah, (v. 2.) And as Joseph was seventeen when he was sold, (xxxvii. 2,) the affair of xxxviii. 1, 2, will be about contemporaneous with the birth of Joseph mentioned in xxx. 24; that is, fourteen years after Jacob had come to Mesopotamia, supposing his residence there to have been only twenty years. Compare xxx. 25 ss., and xxxi. 38. If now Jacob did not marry Rachel until he had served seven years, (xxix. 20, 21,) as not less than three and a half elapsed between his marriage and the birth of his fourth son Judah, (v. 31—35,) only the same space of time will remain between his birth and Joseph's; in other words, between his birth and the affair

with Shuah mentioned in xxxviii. 1, 2, which cannot possibly be correct. If, according to the writers mentioned in note (112,) Jacob married soon after he went to Mesopotamia, Judah will still be no more than ten and a half years old at the time in view. This does not remove the difficulty, while it involves us in another of an exegetical kind. See the note just referred to. Dr. Kennicott, quoted by Dr. Adam Clarke, thinks that Jacob served and lived in connexion with Laban forty years, supposing the twenty years mentioned in xxxi. 38, and that in v. 41, to be two distinct periods.* Perhaps he spent more time in Mesopotamia, or elsewhere out of Canaan, than the brief history narrates, and twenty years of the whole period in Laban's service; for the twenty years mentioned in both these texts do seem to be identical, notwithstanding the learned author's very plausible defence of the contrary view. Such a supposition will relieve us of the embarrassment occasioned by the chronological difficulties equally well with that maintained by Kennicott, while it allows us to give what appears to be the most natural exposition of the two verses just referred to.

There is still another view of this subject, which, if admissible, will effectually remove the difficulty already examined. It supposes, that the design of the author of the book of Genesis was not to mention those of Jacob's family who were living at the time of the descent into Egypt, and then accompanied him and his sons thither, but rather to state the whole number of his family, in order to show how abundant was the harvest, which in a comparatively short time sprang up from such a handful of seed. Compare Ex. i. 5, 7, Deut. x. 22. . Several of his grand-children, there-

* See the remarks appended to Clarke's Commentary on chapter xxxi.

fore, may have been born some time after the settlement in Egypt; and of course his great-grand-children Hezron and Hamul, mentioned in xvi. 12. The sacred writer probably intended to state the number of Jacob's descendants who were living at the time of his death, and from whom the nation of the Israelites descended. It is remarkable, that, although in xvi. 7, "his daughters and his sons' daughters" are spoken of as "brought with him" into Egypt, the only females mentioned in the subsequent catalogue are his daughter Dinah, and Serah the daughter of Asher. Can it be that all his other grand-daughters had died? Or, is it not more probable that they had married Egyptians, or men of some neighboring nation, and consequently are not to be regarded in the light of "mothers in Israel"?

The following considerations in favor of the view above stated are alleged by Hengstenberg in his reply to the objections of Ilgen, De Wette, Von Bohlen, and Lützelberger. *Authentic des Pentateuches*, II. p. 354—359.

1. At the time of the descent into Egypt, Reuben had only two sons, for if he had more, he undoubtedly would not have limited the offer made in xlii. 37, to that number. But in xvi. 9, four sons of Reuben are enumerated, two of whom must consequently have been born in Egypt.—But this argument is not conclusive. Perhaps the original אֶת-שְׁנֵי בָנָי will bear to be rendered 'the two of my sons,' and thus the father will not specify the number of his male children, but offer to the distracted patriarch two lives for one. Besides, it is very easy to conjecture that only two sons of Reuben were present or at home on the occasion referred to.

2. Benjamin is so constantly represented as a young man, that it could hardly have occurred to an Israelite, that at the time of his going to Egypt he was the father of ten sons. Compare Gen. xliii. 8, xlv. 30—33; also xliii. 29.

3. The author seems to hint, with respect to Hezron and

Hamul (v. 12), that they were substitutes for Er and Onan, and that they were not born in Canaan. "And Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan, and the sons of Pharez were Hezron and Hamul." Venema gives the same view of this passage.—The argument seems to rest on the supposition, that on this ground only can a satisfactory reason be given for introducing the phrase, "in the land of Canaan." But the connexion of this clause is rather with the words preceding than with those which follow it, and merely state the fact that the deaths of Er and Onan took place before the descent.

4. Immediately before the genealogy, it is said in xli. 5: "and the sons of Israel carried Jacob their father and *their little ones*, &c."; and, according to xliii. 8, the family consisted of Jacob, his sons and *their "little ones."* But the genealogy presents us with grand-sons of Jacob, who themselves have children. It cannot, therefore, be the author's intention to keep himself to the very point of time when the children of Israel came to Egypt.

5. In Num. xxvi., which contains a census of the Israelites, not a single grand-son of Jacob is mentioned, who has not been already recounted in Gen. xli. ^{*} This is scarcely explicable, if all who are mentioned in Genesis were living at the time of the descent into Egypt. It is quite unreasonable to suppose that no sons were born to Jacob's children after their settlement in that country; although it is in the highest degree probable, that several of those who accompanied their parents died without offspring.

6. In xxxvii. 1, the author announces the "generations" or genealogy of Jacob. His sons had already been enumerated in that of Isaac. It remained to mention his

^{*} The reader will of course bear in mind, that proper allowances must be made for slight changes and transpositions of letters.

grand-sons, and perhaps some of his more distinguished great-grand-sons. In giving this genealogy, it would indeed be of little consequence to inform us where the grand-children were born, but highly important, indeed, not to omit any in the enumeration. Otherwise it were reasonable to expect a second genealogical view, relative to the increase of the patriarchal family in Egypt. But such statistical information is not to be found.

From what has been said, it is evident that it cannot have been the design of the author merely to mention those persons who were already born at the time of the descent into Egypt. "The list comprehends all the males of Jacob's family, whether born in Mesopotamia or in Canaan or in Egypt." Hartmann.

But the result thus attained appears to be in direct opposition to the express declaration of the sacred author himself. He tells us in xli. 26, that "all the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, all the souls were three score and six." This difficulty is increased by the next verse, which specifies Joseph and his sons as already in Egypt, seemingly in contradistinction to those who came there in company with Jacob.

In reply to this very plausible objection, it may be said, that the author considers those who were born in Egypt as having come there with Jacob *in their fathers*. This position is maintained on the following grounds:

1. It is said in v. 27: "all the souls of the house of Jacob which *came into Egypt* were three score and ten." As in this enumeration the sons of Joseph are comprehended in the general number of those who came to Egypt, although they were born in that country, and consequently had come there in the person of their father; so also may other grand-sons of Jacob be enumerated as a part of the aggregate

who are said to have come with him to Egypt, although they came thither in their fathers respectively. This conclusion is irresistible.

2. The phraseology in v. 15 is worthy of notice. "*These* (the whole number named in the preceding verses,) *are the sons* of Leah, which she bore unto Jacob in Padan Aram, with his daughter Dinah; all the souls of *his sons and his daughters were thirty and three.*" Here, and in v. 8, the word "*sons*" may be taken in a limited or more extended meaning. In either case the sons appear as appertaining to the fathers, and born along with them. The same remark applies to v. 18: "these are the sons of Zilpah, whom Laban gave to Leah his daughter, and *these she bare unto Jacob, sixteen souls.*" Compare also v. 25, which is similar.

3. In Deut. x. 22, it is said: "thy fathers went down into Egypt in (not *with*) three score and ten persons," comprehending Joseph's sons as having gone down *in their father*. Compare the language "I will surely bring *thee* up again" in xlv. 4, which refers to Jacob's posterity.

Some of these considerations must be allowed to have great weight, and perhaps the theory which they are intended to maintain most satisfactorily removes the chronological difficulty before stated. These various solutions are submitted to the judgment of the reader.

(146.) It appears from the eighth verse, that the law in Deut. xxv. 5 ss., obliging a man to marry his brother's childless widow, with the view of raising a family for his brother, did not originate with Moses, but was in use in the patriarchal age. Indeed, this remark applies to some other particulars of the Mosaic system. An Essay on this subject by Reimar, published in the *Commentationes Theologicæ*, has been referred to in note (42.)

(147.) The middle clause of the sixth verse may mean, that, having abandoned all his domestic affairs to Joseph, Potiphar was solicitous about nothing but to get his food in proper season: Or, as the food of the Egyptians, or the manner of preparing and using it, differed in some respects from that of the Hebrews, (compare xliii. 32,) that Joseph was not allowed to have any concern with his master's table.

(148.) It has been supposed, that a comparison of Gen. xxxvii., xxxix. and xl., exhibits a difficulty which cannot be removed. In xxxvii. 36, and xxxix. 1, Potiphar is called "the captain of the guard," meaning of the king's body guard. Joseph is sold to this person, calumniated by his wife, and consequently imprisoned by him. He becomes a favorite with *the keeper of the prison*, who commits to him the important trust of the other prisoners, xxxix. 21—23. But in xl. 4, "*the captain of the guard*" is said to charge Joseph with the care of the chief butler and the chief baker. The question has been raised, had Pharaoh two captains of his body guard? and is one of them identical with the keeper of the prison? The answer is easy. The captain of the body guard was commander, in modern phrase, lieutenant, of the prison, as is very plain from xl. 3; and probably the house in which Joseph was confined was an appendage to his residence. Thus, in the time of Jeremiah, "the house of Jonathan the scribe" was employed as a prison. Jer. xxxvii. 15. Still, the state prison of which Potiphar was the commander, had a special inspector, subject to the higher authority of the commander, and this is the person who is called the "keeper of the prison" If now Joseph made himself agreeable and necessary to this officer, who is never called his master, it would be very natural that he should make the useful Hebrew sub-inspector of the prison. Both

before and after the confinement of the chief butler and chief baker, he continues under the higher authority, the captain of the guard, and is still his servant. xli. 12. That Potiphar should entrust these two officers to the care of Joseph involves no difficulty; for doubtless the keeper of the prison had informed him of Joseph's fidelity; and very probably he distrusted the correctness of his wife's report. This is quite reconcileable with the opinion, that prudential considerations prevented him from avowing his servant's innocence by releasing him from prison.

(149.) The expression in the fifth verse, "each man according to the interpretation of his dream," intimates, that the dream of each had a different exposition. Dathe gives the meaning: "diversæ sententiæ somnia." The noun is used for the pronoun: 'each one's dream had its own peculiar interpretation.'

(150.) In v. 13, the words יָשָׁא אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ are rendered in our translation, "shall lift up thy head." The same phrase is employed in Exod. xxx. 12, and Num. i. 49, in the sense of numbering, and this sense agrees well with the use of the phrase in v. 20: "he lifted up the head of the chief butler and of the chief baker in the midst of his servants." It might then be translated literally, 'shall take thy poll;' that is, in recounting his officers, Pharaoh shall number thee, and, as it follows, shall restore thee to thy station. The addition of מִמָּוֶלֶךְ to the same phrase in v. 19, gives a different meaning: 'shall raise thy head *from thee*,' that is, shall put thee to death. Whether this were done by decapitation, or by some other mode of execution, the phrase itself does not determine. In the case before us, suspension, in some form or other, was the mode adopted. See v. 22.

Gesenius, in his *Lexicon*, under נָשָׂא I. (b) (γ), considers the phrase, ‘to lift up the head,’ in this chapter, as elliptical, for the full expression ‘to lift up the head *out of prison* ;’ such places of confinement being usually under ground. He refers to 2 Kings xxv. 27, where the words occur in reference to the king of Babylon and his captive, the king of Judah, whom he released from a long imprisonment. Here the idea of taking the poll would seem to be inadmissible. It is most probable, therefore, that the language in 2 Kings denotes removal from prison, and restoration to liberty. And Gesenius may have seized upon the fundamental thought implied in the phrase, namely, ‘to remove from prison,’ the result of such removal, whether happy or distressful, being expressed by the subsequent language.

“The land of the Hebrews” in v. 15, has been supposed to be an interpolation, but without sufficient reason. The country about Hebron may have been so designated even in Joseph’s time ; and the term “Hebrews” applied to all who were connected with Jacob’s family. Abraham, the Hebrew, had visited Egypt, and probably left there a distinct impression of his patronymic name as well as of his character, and it would doubtless be continued by means of caravans and trading companies. The appellation appears to have been current, and to have needed no interpretation. See xxxix. 14, 17, xli. 12. The Hebrews were probably regarded by the Egyptians as settlers in Canaan, part of which would be called by their name, as other parts were known as the lands of Jebusites, Perizzites, Hittites, &c.

(151.) Some have supposed the word אֶבְרָהָ in v. 43, to be Hebrew, and derived it from עֲבָרָה with the preformative א for ע, meaning “bow the knee.” But most probably it is Egyptian. Various significations have been assigned to

it, according to the supposed origin and composition of the word. FOSTER compares it with *haprechek*, meaning ‘clothed by the king,’ and thinks it refers to the vesture and ornaments just mentioned, and that Joseph’s favor with the monarch was to be announced to the people by a public exhibition and proclamation, as in the case of Mordecai. See Esther vi. 11.—The signification most generally received, however, is that of LA CROZE. He derives the word from *oube rech*, meaning, ‘bend down,’ ‘do reverence before.’ Thus the same idea is supported both by the Egyptian and Hebrew usage. See JABLONSKI *Opuscula*, (edit. TE WATER,) Tom. I. p. 4—8.

(152.) צִפְנֹתָ פֶּעֱנָה. The former of these words is derived by some from צָפַן to hide. The Hebrew affords no analogy that can be relied on with the latter. Yet the meaning of both has been supposed to be, ‘revealer of secrets;’ and this is given by several ancient Jewish authorities.—The terms are no doubt Egyptian, with which the Septuagint *φουδομφανήχ* nearly corresponds, and signify, ‘saviour of the age’ or ‘world.’ DR. L. LOEWE, in a Dissertation on “the Origin of the Egyptian Language, proved by the Analysis of that and the Hebrew,” gives “a very different meaning,” which he “fearlessly asserts it had in the mind of Pharaoh,” namely, “Son of the God of life.” But this result is founded on so many assumptions and fanciful analogies, that it is not likely to be admitted by judicious commentators. Jablonski, who coincides in the meaning above given, has examined the subject at length, *ubi sup.* p. 207—216. Those who have not access to this learned writer, may consult Rosenmüller’s notes, and Gesenius on the word.

(153.) In the several notices which occur in the narrative

respecting the bundles of money found in the sacks, there appears to be a palpable discrepancy. In the first account of this circumstance, (xlii. 27,) on of the brothers is said to have discovered his money on opening "his sack to give his ass provender at the inn;" and afterwards, (v. 35,) on their return home it was found that "every man's bundle of money" had been secured to him in the same manner. Hence it would seem evident, that this discovery was not made until they arrived at their father's house. Whereas, from what is subsequently stated by the brothers to Joseph's steward, (xliii. 21,) it appears no less evident, that it was made at the inn, where, as it was before said, one of them found his money in his sack's mouth.—It is possible, that the agitation of mind under which the communication was made to the steward, (see particularly v. 18,) may have led the speaker into a slight mistake, inducing him to say, that that took place at the inn which happened partly there and partly at home. Or it may be, that several opened their sacks at the inn, although one only is said to have done so in xlii. 27, and thus what occurred to several in that place, and to the rest of them at home, is represented to the steward in general terms as happening at the inn, the mere circumstance of place being regarded as indifferent. To suppose a contradiction of this kind in the author, would be irreconcilable with his character as an intelligent and careful historian, (which the whole tenor of his book proves,) independently of his inspiration.

(154.) In v. 32, it is said: to "eat with the Hebrews is an abomination unto the Egyptians." HERODOTUS tells us, that the Egyptians would not associate much with the Greeks, nor use any of their culinary utensils. See II. 41; in BELOE'S Translation, Vol. I. p. 328, Philadelphia edition, 1814. It is not likely that the Greeks were exclusively the

objects of their aversion; most probably it extended to foreigners in general. Thus it affords one reason for the statement of abhorrence so strongly represented in the text. Besides, the cattle that were slaughtered and eaten by the Hebrews, were, in some of the nomes of Egypt, regarded as objects of worship.—It is also afterwards said, that “every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians.” xlvi. 34. It is evident that this cannot be understood of shepherds universally, for the king had his own flocks and shepherds, as is plain from xlvii. 6. Compare also Exod. ix. 3, 4, 6, 19—21. These texts prove that the occupation was not unusual among the Egyptians. (See also WILKINSON’S *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, Vol. I. p. 239, chap. iii. and II. p. 15, chap. iv., where the Egyptian “pastors” are mentioned as belonging to the fourth caste, and are “subdivided into oxherds, shepherds, goatherds, and swineherds.”) It has been said, that they kept flocks simply for the milk, skin, and wool, and abstained entirely from the use of them for food. GROTIUS, on xlvi. 34, gives as a reason for the declaration there made, “that the shepherds deprived the cattle of life and used the flesh for food;” and says that “the Egyptians kept flocks for the sake of the wool and milk.” *Quia pastores pecori vitam adimebant, et carne vescebantur.*—*Pecora Ægyptii habebant, sed lanæ et lactis causa.* Aben Ezra also tells us that “the Egyptians did not then eat flesh,” *בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם לֹא הָיוּ הַמִּצְרִיִּם אוֹכְלִי בָסָר*, and he compares them with the natives of India, who abstain, he says, both from flesh and milk. But that the Egyptians did avoid the use of flesh is not susceptible of proof, as Bryant has abundantly shown in his *Analysis of Ancient Mythology*; although some of his quotations from Herodotus are of doubtful application. See Vol. VI. p. 168—176, 8vo. London, 1807. In some nomes they used as articles of food what were objects of worship in others.

See HEEREN'S *Ideen über die Politik, &c.* translated into English, and published under the title of "Historical Researches into the Politics, Intercourse, and Trade of the Carthaginians, Ethiopians, and Egyptians, Vol. II. p. 183, Oxford edition. That the ancient Egyptians used flesh very freely, particularly beef and goose, appears from the sculptures which still remain. See Wilkinson, Vol. II. p. 367 ss., chap. vii. It is also plainly alluded to in Ex. xvi. 3, where the murmuring Hebrews long for "the flesh-pots" at which they were in the habit of enjoying themselves when in Egypt. Still, the *indiscriminate* use of the flesh of cattle for food by the Hebrews and foreign shepherds, may afford another reason why both were regarded by the Egyptians with abhorrence.

A further reason has been assigned why shepherds, and consequently Hebrews, who, in common with their ancestors, led a pastoral life, were held in detestation by the Egyptians. It is said that they had suffered much and long from the invasion of the shepherd race, who had usurped the government and exercised a foreign sway over the nation, so that the very name and occupation were abominable to them. SHUCKFORD, indeed, in his *Sacred and Profane History Connected*, Book VII. Vol. II. p. 205—210, places the invasion of these foreigners considerably after this period, and supposes the king who arose after Joseph's death, and disregarded the services which he had rendered the nation, to have been the first of this new dynasty. But this hypothesis, like some others of the same author, is unfounded. The best supported theories, and those which are most generally received, allow a much earlier date to this invasion. Hales, in his *new Analysis of Chronology*, Vol. II. p. 157, places it six years before the birth of Abraham; Usher, eighty-eight. See his *Chronologia Sacra*, anno mundi 1920 and 2008. Bryant also assigns to it a period

anterior to the time of that patriarch, Vol. VI. p. 153. He enters largely into the history of this shepherd race, exhibits all that is said of them by Manetho, Josephus, and others; distinguishes them from the Hebrews, whose settlement he thinks was subsequent to their expulsion; and details many interesting particulars, mingled, however, with not a little that is fanciful and groundless. See Vol. IV. p. 301 ss., and VI. p. 1—187. Wilkinson is also of opinion, that “the hatred borne against shepherds by the Egyptians was not owing solely to their contempt for that occupation. This feeling,” says he, “originated in another and a far more powerful cause,—the previous occupation of their country by a pastor race, who had committed great cruelties during their possession of the country; and the already existing prejudice against shepherds when the Hebrews arrived, plainly shows their invasion to have happened previous to that event.” Vol. II. p. 16, chap. iv. If, now, these shepherd invaders had been driven out from Egypt a short time before the age of Joseph, no wonder that shepherds should have been detested by the natives. This supposition is in harmony with the incidents mentioned in the narrative; it adds point to the affected suspicion of Joseph, that his brothers were spies, and shows that Pharaoh’s allowing them to occupy the land of Goshen was politic, as the Hebrews, placed on the Arabian frontier, became a sort of barrier, to prevent the invasion of any foreign aggressors from the east.

Many writers, however, identify the shepherds with the Israelites, considering the narrative of Manetho, from whom chiefly the account of this race is drawn, as too confused and uncertain to be relied on with confidence. See Buddæus, *Hist. Ecc.* V. T. Period. I. sect. iii. § 24, Tom. I. p. 451 ss.; Witsius, *Ægyptiaca*, Lib. III. p. 208—216; Vitrिंगa in *Isa.* cap. xix. *Notitia Ægypti*, xxxi. xxxii. Tom. I. p. 549, 550;

and Perizonius, *Ægyptiarum Originum et Temporum Anti-quissimorum Investigatio*, cap. xix. p. 328—352.

The learned, acute, and careful German author, Heeren, considers the whole account of the shepherd race, the hyksos of Manetho, as referring to the repeated invasions and attacks to which lower Egypt was subjected from the east, and particularly by Arabians, in proportion as it became more cultivated and settled by immigration from the south, and comprehending the settlement of these foreigners, who were finally expelled by the combined efforts of several contemporaneous Egyptian kings. *Historical Researches, &c.* Vol. II. chap. ii. p. 115 ss. He acquiesces in the view of Manetho, who “places the elevation of Joseph within this period,” remarking that “the favorable reception of his family, leading a shepherd life, will be certainly most explicable during the sway of a shepherd dynasty.” p. 117. See also p. 119. On the Egyptian aversion to shepherds he makes the following remarks: “The extensive table lands which the nomad herdsman inhabited, were seldom [entirely] subject to the Pharaohs, probably never; and the dominion over nomad hordes, from their very nature, must at all times be very uncertain and variable. From their whole manner of life, they can scarcely be considered otherwise than as natural enemies, which must be borne with, because they cannot be got rid of. To this, therefore, we may attribute the hate and scorn in which they were at all times held, and which the ruling priest caste carefully strove to nourish. “The neatherds are to the Egyptians an abomination,” was said in the Mosaic period, and traces of the contempt with which they were regarded are found in Herodotus, ii. 128. There is no proof, however, that this disgrace attached to those cultivators, who, being proprietors of land, made the tending and breeding of cattle their business. Black cattle were by no means unclean in Egypt; the cow was sacred

to Isis, and oxen generally served for food and sacrifice ; it is not therefore likely that the management of them should have caused defilement. It was not so much the keeping of cattle, which, in fact, was equally indispensable with agriculture, as the nomad life, which was directly opposed to the views and policy of the ruling caste.

Besides, to this caste [of shepherds] seem to have belonged the tribes which had taken up their abode in the marshy plains of the Delta. According to Strabo, (p. 1142,) these were especially assigned by the ancient Pharaohs for the abode of the neatherds. The tribes which dwelt there had, nevertheless, as we are told by Herodotus, (ii. 92,) adopted Egyptian manners ; but they still remained half barbarians, and even robbers, for the thickets of reeds not only supplied them with the materials for their huts, but likewise protected them from the approach of strangers. Diod. i. 52. Heliodorus draws a similar picture of them. *Æthiop.* i. 5." p. 148, 149.

The theory favored by Heeren is maintained also by Dr. J. M. Jost, in his general history of the Israelites, *Allgemeine Geschichte des Israelitischen Volks*, Berlin, 1832. In Vol. I. p. 67, 74, he advances it incidentally, but afterwards, p. 94—97, he defends it at length. As his argument comprehends probably all that can be urged with any weight in favor of this view, it may be well to give the reader an abstract of it.

Jost places the exode about the middle or latter half of the fifteenth century before the Christian era, in the time of the fifth Ramesses. The fourth of this name, Ramesses Meiamum, died in the year A.C. 1493, after a reign of sixty-six years. About one hundred and fifty or two hundred years before, the dynasty of these kings had put an end to the authority of the shepherds, which had lasted two hundred and sixty years. Coming immediately after that of

the shepherds, it must have been unfriendly to the Israelites, to whom that race was favorable, as it was altogether natural to expect that they would be. The shepherds were Shemites, descendants probably of Eber, and allied to the Israelites in spirit, language, and occupation; which very circumstances would make them hateful to the Egyptians. This agrees with the apprehension of Pharaoh, that the Hebrews, who had become exceedingly numerous, might avail themselves of the occasion of a war to leave the country and increase the number of hostile neighbors. Ex. i. 10. Hence it is plain that the Israelites were able at that time to draw together a considerable army to act against the ruling dynasty. It follows, therefore, that several generations, certainly more than two hundred years, must have passed away since Jacob and his family settled in Egypt.* Hence it appears also, as the shepherd dynasty lasted only two hundred and sixty years, that their settlement must have taken place not long after the commencement of that dynasty.

This conclusion is corroborated by the simple narrative of Joseph, which presumes the reader to be acquainted with Egyptian history. In the first place the term *Hebrews* is applied, without immediate reference to Israel, whose family was small, to the whole body of the shepherd people,† who as such were hated by the Egyptians. This agrees with the opinion that they had conquered the country, and that the ruling monarchs were selected from their number and forced upon the people, by whom they were held in detestation, although they did accommodate themselves to the Egyptian laws and usages.

* Jost adheres to the chronology which is supported by the Hebrew text, and maintains that the Israelites resided in Egypt four hundred and thirty years. See Exod. xii. 40.

† Gen. xxxix. 14, xl. 15, xli. 12, xliii. 31, Ex. i. 16, iii. 18, and viii.

Secondly, it was only under such a foreigner, and in such circumstances, that Joseph could have been raised to distinction. Hence the cup-bearer mentioned him as a *Hebrew* youth, able to interpret dreams ; and hence the king, of the same stock originally, determined to send for him, as the *Egyptian* wise men gave him no satisfaction. The advice of Joseph was gladly taken, because the king perceived immediately that the establishment and independence of his people would be promoted by it. To have a Hebrew in his service as administrator of the kingdom would be agreeable to his dependents ; and his foes, the priests, were soothed by freeing them from civil burthens, and securing their incomes. And, although he conferred the right of citizenship on Joseph, giving him an Egyptian name and marrying him to the daughter of the priest of the sun, yet he did not venture to violate the feelings of the people, and Joseph did not sit at the same table with the Egyptian lords, because they would not eat with the shepherd race. Gen. xliii. 21.

Thirdly, when Joseph's brothers came to Egypt, they undoubtedly recognized him as *the Hebrew*, for his story must have been generally known ; but it never occurred to them that he was their brother, whom they had sold, as there were certainly many Hebrews in the land, and some of them men of distinction. He confirmed their error by employing an interpreter. And it is only on the supposition here maintained, that he could affect to regard his ten brothers as spies ; for, while the shepherd race held the power, it is very conceivable that their jealousy might be excited by the apprehension of further inroads by others of the same stock. Such a feigned charge preferred by a governor acting under the authority of the genuine Egyptian family, would be altogether inexplicable.

Lastly, Pharaoh was pleased with the account of Joseph's family. Did he know that they were shepherds ? And were

he an Egyptian, would he have allowed such men, hateful to his people, to settle in Egypt? But if he were himself of the same stock, his own satisfaction and that of his courtiers is what might be expected from the characteristic hospitality of the race. Thus the Israelites were connected with the government, but hated by the Egyptian people. The remains of Jacob are embalmed, and, agreeably to his last will, committed to his own sepulchre, accompanied by many Egyptian lords, solemnities which it is not to be supposed that the enemies of the shepherd race would have allowed. The place in Canaan where the mourning ceremonies of the funeral were performed, was called by the inhabitants, Abel Misraim, (mourning of the Egyptians,) because they were all conducted according to the Egyptian manner.

There is certainly weight in some of the suggestions here advanced. And yet they are not of sufficient force to remove all doubt from an inquirer's mind. The first argument assumes the general application of the term Hebrews to the whole body of the shepherd people. The truth of this cannot perhaps be denied, but the evidence of it is plainly unsatisfactory. The last of the author's references is probably a typographical error, as it has no bearing on the point. The others, although they harmonize with his view, are evidently inadequate to prove it. Indeed there is only one, (Gen. xliii. 31,) which, as proof, carries with it even plausibility. Still, the term Hebrew may have been applied to other races descended from the patriarch Eber, beside that of Jacob.

The second argument seems also to be inconclusive. Undoubtedly "Joseph could have been raised to distinction under such a foreigner and in such circumstances;" but wherein lies the impossibility or even the great difficulty of his elevation under a native monarch? The cup-bearer

mentions Joseph to Pharaoh, not particularly as a *Hebrew* youth, but as a companion in trouble, whom prosperity had led him to forget, and of whom he is reminded by the monarch's very remarkable dream. The king would naturally send for him, whether he were of the same stock with himself or not, for the plain reason that the Egyptian wise men were unable to satisfy his mind. On the same principle, the Babylonian monarch, in similar circumstances, sent for Daniel. Dan. v. 13—16.—Politically considerations may indeed have led Pharaoh to adopt the counsel of Joseph, but a moderate degree of good sense would of itself induce him to follow it. The high estimate in which the priests were held sufficiently accounts for 'the benefit of clergy' with which Pharaoh thought proper to favor them. And that Joseph and the Egyptian lords dined at separate tables, is at least as explicable on the theory that the ruling dynasty was Egyptian, as on that of Jost and Heeren. Indeed, on this theory, the supposition that the hostile feelings of the natives, whether of the common class or of the grandees, towards the shepherds, showed themselves as is represented in the history, seems to involve a difficulty. It appears unnatural to understand the term "Egyptian," in the thirty-fourth verse of the forty-sixth chapter, of the subjugated natives. So bold an expression of contempt and detestation is not likely to have been generally made by the people at the very time that they were forced to submit to the hated rulers. Still, it cannot be denied, that such a state of things as this would imply might temporarily exist, as was the case in England in a considerable degree during some time after the Norman conquest. The brevity of the narrative, and the want of other clear historical data, seem to preclude the possibility of arriving at thorough satisfaction on such a topic.

The third argument of Jost is based on the supposition

which he assumes in the first, which would indeed account for the fact that Joseph's brethren did not recognize him, but is by no means necessary for this purpose. And surely Joseph might affect to regard them as spies, if the shepherd dynasty had been conquered and expelled not long before their arrival.—And, in reference to the last argument, it is evident, that the kindness with which Joseph was himself regarded by Pharaoh, and the gratitude of the monarch for his favorite's services both to himself and the nation, are sufficient to account for the friendly reception of his father and family; although the author's theory is quite in harmony with the circumstances of the narrative. It agrees also with the remark in Ex. i. 8, that "a new king arose, who did not regard Joseph." For, if the re-establishment of the rightful Egyptian dynasty on the expulsion of the shepherds is here meant, Joseph's memory would of course be disregarded, and the Israelitish population despised.

(155.) xliv. 5. The phrase נִחֵשׁ וְנִחָשׁ in this verse, in all probability, is equivalent to the same phrase in v. 15. Most of the ancient versions, including the Septuagint and Vulgate, give it the meaning of *augur, divine*; and this is adopted by our English translation, although in the margin it follows the Chaldee Targum, and renders it, *search*. The former meaning is undoubtedly the usual sense of the word. In addition to these two places, it occurs elsewhere in the Bible, in Gen. xxx. 27, Lev. xix. 26, Num. xxiii. 23, xxiv. 1, Deut. xviii. 10, 1 Kings xx. 33, 2 Kings xvii. 17, xxi. 6, and 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6. In some of these places it is connected with other words expressive of magical superstition, and always conveys this idea, or that of foreboding or taking as an omen, unless Gen. xxx. 27, and the texts under consideration, be regarded as exceptions. If the idea of divining be intended, it will not follow that the cup is represented as the

medium by which the divination was practised. That cannot be Joseph's meaning in v. 15, for the cup had not been in his possession, and to recover it would have been the very intention of the supposed divination. Neither is it the necessary meaning of the clause in the fifth verse, which may be rendered, after several of the Jewish interpreters, 'on account of which he would divine;' that is, he would resort to divination in order to ascertain what had become of it. See Munster, De Muis, and Cartwright in the *Critici Sacri*.

The practice of divining by means of a cup is mentioned by Rosenmüller in his *Alte und neue Morgenland*, I. p. 210 ss. He refers to JAMBLICUS on the Mysteries of the Egyptians, Lib. III. sect. 14, who says, that by means of certain figures reflected by the rays of light in clear water, future circumstances were prognosticated; and to AUGUSTIN, who, in his treatise, *de Civitate Dei*, Lib. VII. cap. 35, quotes a place of a lost work of Varro, wherein it is said that this sort of divination originated with the Persians.

The manner of divination is stated to be as follows. Small pieces of gold or silver leaf or thin plate were thrown into a cup, intermingled with precious stones, on which certain characters were engraven. Then the inquirer repeated some forms of adjuration, and invoked the devil. The answer was communicated in various ways: sometimes by an intelligible voice; sometimes by the same signs appearing on the surface of the water as had been engraven on the precious stones; sometimes by exhibiting the image of the person respecting whom the applicant would inquire. CORNELIUS AGRIPPA, *de Occulta Philosophia*, Lib. I. cap. 57, mentions also, that many were accustomed to throw melted wax into a vessel of water, and from the forms which it assumed, to infer the answers to the proposed inquiries.

In addition to the writers above mentioned, Rosenmüller

refers to NORDEN's Travels in Egypt and Nubia, D'HERBELLOT's *Bibliothèque Orientale* under Giam and Giemschid, and VON HAMMER's Collection of Poems.

Of the fact that such a superstitious usage existed, there can be no doubt; whether it prevailed as anciently as the time of Joseph, is uncertain. However, if divination of any kind is alluded to in the places before us, this will not prove that Joseph practised it. Both he and the steward may accommodate their language to the ignorance of the brothers. And in neither of the verses is a direct act of Joseph necessarily implied; the meaning may be, that he could ascertain the theft by applying to the divines, for which his dignity and station afforded him every facility.

(156.) In the details of v. 8—27, it is proper to note some slight difficulties. In v. 8, Jacob is mentioned, because he is the head of all, and therefore properly introduces "the children of Israel." Or else this phrase is equivalent to 'Israelites,' as 'children of Eber,' x. 21, is to 'Hebrews,' and consequently includes Jacob himself.—The order in which the names of the children are given is as follows: (1) Leah's children; Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulon; (2) Zilpah's; Gad, Asher; (3) Rachel's; Joseph, Benjamin; (4) Bilhah's; Dan, Naphtali.—Shuckford, *ubi sup.* p. 198, supposes that the names of the other sons were originally added to Reuben's, and have been lost. But this is a mere conjecture, and in Num. xxvi. 5, the list is similar.

Verse 15. To introduce Jochabed from Ex. vi. 20, in order to make up the number thirty-three, is exceedingly unreasonable, unless it be supposed to have fallen out of the text in this place, for which there is no warrant. It is far better to allow a popular and somewhat loose phraseology, and to include Jacob himself in the reckoning. Of course,

Dinah must be added, and the sons of Pharez, as those of Beriah are in v. 17. Er and Onan were dead. The word “daughters” is an enallage numeri, the plural for the singular, as in v. 23, the term “sons.”

Verse 20. Here and elsewhere the Septuagint differs greatly from the Hebrew text. Perhaps it is interpolated. It is by no means important to reconcile the two. Compare Num. xxvi. 29, 1 Chron. vii. 14, 20. In v. 27 also, the Septuagint reads *nine* instead of *two*, disagreeing with v. 20, and without the sanction of one ancient version.—In Acts vii. 14, the number of Jacob’s family that settled in Egypt is said to have been seventy-five; here, seventy. The commentators, and particularly KUINOEL on the Acts, state the various ways of reconciling this discrepancy. Dr. Hales, *ubi sup.* Vol. II. p. 160, attempts to remove the difficulty thus. Excluding Jacob, the father, and Joseph and his two sons, who were already in Egypt, the number is sixty-six. To this he adds nine wives, Judah’s being dead, Joseph’s already in Egypt, and Simeon’s being also dead, which he infers from the fact that Shaul was the son of a Canaanitish woman, (v. 10 ;) which will hardly be allowed much weight as an argument.—I suppose St. Stephen gave the commonly received number, founded on the Septuagint, as St. Paul also most probably does in Gal. iii. 17; without, in either case, authorizing the enumeration of that version.

(157.) Jablonski, *ubi sup.* Tom. II. p. 77—224, places Goshen in upper Egypt, in the prefecture of Hercules, νομὶς Ἡρακλεώτης, an island made in the Heptanomis, by means of a canal connected in two places with the Nile, and called to this day ‘the canal of Joseph.’ But, notwithstanding the very extensive discussions of this learned writer, the facts stated in the history of the Exode seem evidently to show, that it must have been situated east of the Nile, in lower

Egypt, and not a great distance from the western arm of the Red Sea. It was probably near the ancient Heliopolis, and being a flat country, and distinguished for the richness of the soil, and the excellence of its pasturage, was in all respects most suitable for the Hebrews, both with respect to their residence, and the facilities it afforded for their removal. In Gen. xlvii. 11, it is named, either in whole or in part, “the land of Rameses.” The author just referred to, *ubi sup.* p. 136, explains this word by ‘men of sheep,’ ‘persons leading the pastoral life;’ and supposes the name to have been applied by the Israelites, meaning ‘shepherd country.’ But the city of the same name mentioned in Exod. i. 11, as built or at least repaired and ornamented by the Israelites, he identifies with On or Heliopolis,* now called by the Arabs *Ain shemesh*, ‘eye or fountain of the sun;’ and he analyses the word, so as to derive the meaning of ‘country’ or ‘place of the sun.’ p. 138, 139. Goshen is often called in the Septuagint Γεσὴν or Γεσῆμ Ἀραβίας, as it lay contiguous to the latter country, and the name Arabia was anciently employed, somewhat loosely, to comprehend all that region of land east of the Nile, and bordering on Arabia properly so denominated. See Bryant’s Analysis, Vol. VI. p. 105 ss.; Rosenmüller on Gen. xlv. 10; and his A. und N. Morgenland, Vol. I. p. 215.—The hypothesis of Jablonski is examined and refuted by Michaelis in his *Supplementa ad Lexica Hebraica*, under גֹּשֶׁן, p. 371—381. On the situation of Goshen, see also Buddæus, *Hist. Eccles.* V. T. Per. iii. sect. iii. § 13, Tom. I. p. 336.

That the Mitzraim to which the Israelites went was not Egypt, but a country in sandy Arabia, is a theory main-

* N. B. The Septuagint in Exod. i. 11, evidently distinguishes them: τὴν Πιζώμ, καὶ Παμεσσή, καὶ Ὠν, ἣ ἐστὶν Ἑλιόπολις.

tained by BEKE; but how unsuccessfully, is shown in the London Quarterly Review for November, 1834.

(158.) Instead of “he removed,” (v. 21,) the Septuagint, agreeing with the Samaritan Pentateuch, and followed by the Vulgate, reads, ‘he subjected,’ κατεδουλώσατο. The substitution of a ד for a ר in the word הַעֲבִיר accounts for this meaning; which, it must be granted, agrees very well with the context, and expresses the feudatory condition to which the people were reduced under the monarch. If the present Hebrew reading be correct, the meaning may be, that Joseph, having secured to the crown the right of all the lands, made a new distribution to the former owners, transferring them, however, to residences remote from their native places, thus obliging them to form new associations, and lessening the probability of sedition. See Grotius in loc. לְעָרִים “to cities,” will then be elliptical for, ‘from cities to cities,’ as the Targum renders it. If it should be said, that such an arrangement would be a wanton exercise of power, indicating the arbitrary will of a tyrant, rather than the benevolence of a kind and equitable governor, the evident answer is, that we are too little acquainted with the internal condition of Egypt at that time, to enable us to form a right judgment in the case. Such a distribution of persons and property may have been necessary, in order to secure the peace and safety of the community.—Another interpretation, however, has been proposed, namely, that Joseph removed the people from the country to their respective cities, for the more convenient distribution of food; and that this regulation extended throughout the whole of Egypt. This view agrees, no doubt, with the Hebrew, and requires no ellipsis. But it seems inconsistent with the context, for the twenty-first verse is closely connected both with the preceding and subsequent, making the removal spoken of an immediate

result of what had just been stated ; whereas, if the chief or only object to be effected were convenience, it might be supposed that the regulation would have been adopted from the first. Perhaps, however, as the severity of the famine increased, and the repeated failures of the Nile to overflow its banks augmented the sterility of the soil, the inhabitants entirely abandoned all agricultural efforts, and, at Joseph's direction, removed to their respective cities. On the cessation of the famine, they may have returned to their former residences.—It is evident, that the people do not consider Joseph's arrangement as a hardship ; on the contrary, they regard him as their benefactor and saviour.

(159.) Instead of “head of the bed,” in v. 31, the Septuagint has ‘top of his staff,’ reading *מִטָּה* for *מִטָּה*, and this is followed by the apostle in Heb. xi. 21. The idea is, that, bent down by years and infirmities, the venerable Jacob leaned on his trusty staff, the companion of his wanderings, (see xxxii. 11,) and in this posture gave thanks. In the place just referred to, however, another word, *מִקְלָה*, is used for “staff.”—The common reading and translation are quite perspicuous. The patriarch turns his face toward the pillow of his bed, to exclude from his mind all external objects, while he expresses his gratitude to God. Both Symmachus and Aquila retain the word ‘bed,’ and this meaning appears to be sanctioned by 1 Kings i. 47, “and the king bowed himself upon the bed ;” for, although the word there employed is *מִשְׁכָּב*, yet the whole turn of the expression is the same as that of the text. Compare also, for the general sentiment, 2 Kings xx. 2 : “then he turned his face to the wall and prayed.”

(160.) The nature of the case requires this, and probably the Hebrew expresses it. The Septuagint and Vulgate un-

doubtedly do; the former has ἐναλλὰξ τὰς χεῖρας, and the latter commutans manus.

(161.) It cannot be denied that in v. 15, 16, the "God" of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is identified with "the Angel" who is said to have "redeemed" the patriarch "from all evil," and whom he invokes to "bless the lads." It is certain, therefore, that Jacob regards this being as divine.

(162.) With xlviii. 22, compare John iv. 5. See also Gen. xxxiii. 18, 19, and Josh. xxiv. 32, from which it would appear that this property was originally purchased by Jacob. Probably, after Jacob's removal mentioned in the thirty-fifth chapter, it had been seized by the Hittites, (called here by the general name of Amorites,) from whom it had subsequently been forcibly recovered by the patriarch.

(163.) The genuineness of Jacob's dying address to his sons was questioned by Le Clerc, and since his time, has been denied by several German critics, who are unwilling to allow it a higher antiquity than the age of David. A notice of the chief writers on both sides of this question may be seen in Rosenmüller's note on the first verse. He acquiesces in the generally received opinion, that we have the declarations of the dying patriarch, which his children and their posterity had been careful to preserve. The objections which have been urged against this opinion are of very little weight: indeed, to the consistent believer in divine revelation, of none at all. The unusual elevation of the style is altogether in character with the subject of the address and its poetic conformation, and somewhat of sublimity might be expected in such a speaker and on such an occasion. And it may well be assumed, that Jacob had some natural poetic talent, which the circumstances in which he was, and the re-

mote future towards which he looked, would naturally have called into exercise. Moreover, his address is in part prophetic. The inspired mind of the patriarch sees distant events, and describes them in the same manner as other prophets exhibit their revelations; in language considerably figurative, and in general terms, sufficiently clear indeed to constitute predictions, and yet not so perspicuous in particulars, as history, written subsequently to the facts and circumstances announced, would naturally have described them. The ground on which the genuineness of this portion of Genesis has been denied, would, if admitted, do away whatever is properly prophetic in the sacred scriptures; and in fact, this is the result to which neological principles have led their advocates.

The simplicity with which some of the opponents of the genuineness of this chapter state their views may almost be considered as amusing. "The most natural view (says VATER,) that can be adopted after reading this beautiful poem, is certainly this: that it was sung at a time when the Israelitish tribes held possession of the land of Canaan, and had experienced the fates which are herein so clearly described." And BERTOLDT, after remarking that "criticism can have no other object in view than to establish and elucidate historical truth," infers, that "*consequently* an inclination has for a long time prevailed, to consider as interpolations and additions of a later age, whatever the Pentateuch contains, which manifestly cannot have been written by Moses, with the ordinary natural powers of a man." See Hengstenberg's *Authentic des Pentateuchs*, II. p. 181, who very properly observes, that it requires neither art nor wit to discover anachronisms on such principles as these.

Herder, in his fifth letter on the study of theology, p. 62, supposes, that the well known character of Jacob's sons suggested to the dying patriarch the germ of his predictions respecting the descendants of each. As we are very im-

perfectly informed of the actions and characteristics of each of these individuals, and also of each tribe, we cannot go much beyond conjecture in relation to such a point. The reference to some facts in the lives of Reuben, Simeon, Levi and Joseph, is in favor of Herder's supposition. If the history of each tribe had been particularly detailed in the Bible, Jacob's last declarations would no doubt be clearer, and their prophetic character the more fully illustrated.

(164.) Notes on xlix. :

v. 2. בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים. 'In future ages, hereafter.' This phrase, which is sometimes applied to the time of the Messiah and the dispensation of the Gospel, as in Isa. ii. 2, Mic. iv. 1, is frequently used in the general sense of futurity. See Num. xxiv. 14, Deut. iv. 30, Dan. ii. 28. The contents of the chapter prove this to be the meaning here.

3. רְאוּבֵן בְּכֹרִי אֶתָּה כֹּהֵן וְרֵאשִׁית אֹזְנִי. 'Reuben, my first-born art thou, my strength, and the beginning of my power.' The latter expressions have been supposed to convey the idea of vigor, beyond what might be thought to belong to children born in a more advanced age of the parent. Compare הַבְּכֹרִי and רֵאשִׁית אֹזְנִי in Deut. xxi. 17; and see Ps. lxxviii. 51, cv. 36. The Septuagint translates this phrase in Deuteronomy, and here by ἀρχὴ τέλειος μᾶ, which gives the general idea of priority of birth, and perhaps nothing more is intended. The same language is used by Virgil in the *Æneid*, I. 664, where Venus addresses her son in these terms :

"Nate, meæ vires, mea magna potentia."

See also Ovid, *Met.* v. 365.

וְהָרַר שְׂאֵת וְהָרַר עֶז. 'The superiority of excellence, and the superiority of dignity,' that is, the abstract for the concrete, 'chief in excellence, and chief in dignity.' שְׂאֵת

is used for excellence in Job xiii. 11, and perhaps in Gen. iv. 7. זֶרַע is often expressive of dignity, (compare Hab. iii. 4,) and is sometimes translated in the Septuagint by $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ and $\sigma\upsilon\mu\chi\eta$. See Ps. lxviii. 35, (34.) xxix. 1, xcvi. 7, Isa. xii. 2. It is generally rendered in this passage by 'strength' or 'power.' Thus our English translation, De Wette, and Rosenmüller. But the parallelism with זֶרַע is better preserved by translating it 'dignity,' and then both the clauses of the verse, זֶרַע וְיָרֵךְ and זֶרַע וְיָרֵךְ , express the same general idea of majesty. Dathe gives a similar view of the meaning: princeps dignitate, princeps honore; and the Vulgate version of the latter clause is, major in imperio. The Chaldee paraphrases explain the whole passage of the rights of primogeniture, priesthood, and royalty, taken away by the patriarch from his eldest son, and conferred respectively on Joseph, to whom was given the double portion, (compare 1 Chron. v. 1, 2, Gen. xlviii. 5,) on Levi, from whom sprang the sacerdotal family, and on Judah, who was the ancestor of the line of David.

4. $\text{פָּחַז בְּמַיִם אֶל-תּוֹתֵר}$. 'Lasciviousness, (bursting out, or boiling over,) like water, thou shalt not be chief.' It is not easy to determine the meaning of פָּחַז . It occurs only four times in the Bible; twice in the form of the participle Benoni פְּחִיזִים , meaning light and vicious persons, Jud. ix. 4, Zeph. iii. 4, once as a noun in the construct state, פְּחִיזֵיהֶם , their lightness, Jer. xxiii. 32, and in this place. In Syriac ܦܚܝܙ means 'to be lascivious,' and the noun in the emphatic form, ܦܚܝܙܐ , is used for lasciviousness in the Syriac version, 2 Cor. xii. 21, Eph. iv. 19. This signification suits the context, and may be implied in the other three places where the word is used. If the phrase "like water" be intended to illustrate the clause immediately following, the force of the comparison will lie in this, that the insolent

and lascivious conduct of Reuben is likened to water, which breaks through all restraint, and spreads its desolating inundation over the private and most highly cultivated garden. Or else, more probably, the figure is taken from water swelling and foaming and boiling in a pot, so as to overflow its sides, as Gesenius thinks. See his *Lexicon*, and also his *Commentatio de Pentateuchi Samaritani Origine, &c.* p. 33. If the figure were abandoned, the idea might be expressed thus: 'unrestrained in lasciviousness.' I have substituted the adjective for the noun, in accommodation to the English idiom. The Vulgate version is, *effusus es sicut aqua*; the Septuagint, ἐξέβρισθης ὡς ὑδωρ, thou hast burst out in insolence like water. Water when poured out, sinks into the ground, or evaporates in the air, without the possibility of being gathered again, (compare 2 Sam. xiv. 14); thus the figure will intimate Reuben's loss of supremacy, which is fully expressed in that clause.—But most probably the connexion of this phrase is with the preceding word.

כִּי עָלִיתָ מִשְׁכְּבִי אֲבִיךָ. 'Because thou ascendedst the bed of thy father.' See Gen. xxxv. 22.

אֲזַ חֲפָלָה — יָצוּעִי עָלָה; 'Then didst thou pollute it.—He ascended my couch.' Dathe would connect these two clauses, and read עָלָה in the infinitive; and, therefore, he translates the whole thus: *polluisti stratum meum isto ascensu*, or, *ascendendo*, and De Wette agrees with him: *entweihtest mein Lager besteigend*. There is more force, however, in considering the latter clause as conveying an abrupt declaration of the patriarch's injured feelings, when he recollected the insolent and libidinous attack which his eldest son had made upon his domestic peace. The change of person, which is very common in Hebrew poetry as well as in all other, places the speaker's indignation in a stronger light, and makes him appeal for its justice to the sympathies and feelings of all who heard him.

5. שִׁמְעוֹן וְלֵוִי אֶחָדִים. 'Simeon and Levi are brethren.' They were the sons of Leah, (see Gen. xxix. 33, 34,) children of the same mother, and of the same character and disposition, which is no doubt the idea intended to be conveyed. Compare the use of *ἰσχυρὰ* in Matt. xxiii. 31. — כְּלֵי חַמָּס מִכְרֹתֵיהֶם : 'Instruments of violence are their swords.' It is impossible to say with certainty what is the sense of this place. It refers to the history in chap. xxxiv. The chief difficulty lies in the word מִכְרֹתֵיהֶם, the meaning of which, as it never occurs elsewhere, has been sought in the cognate languages. Dathe derives it from the Syriac, סַכֵּץ, 'to betroth,' and translates thus: sponsalia cruenta perfecerunt; referring of course to the negotiations relating to Dinah's marriage in xxxiv. 8—24. But, as it does not appear that Simeon and Levi took a more prominent part in this matter than their brothers, and as the marriage was not effected, this translation is not supported by the history.—DE DIEU and others appeal to the Ethiopic and Arabic for the sense of 'consultations, machinations,' and this seems to be the meaning of the Septuagint, συνετέλεσαν ἀδικίαν ἐξ ἀνέσεως ἀνθρώπων. All these versions require a different reading of the first word, viz. כְּלֵי for כְּלִי, and this has the sanction of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which reads כָּלִי. The meaning will then be: 'they accomplished or executed their iniquitous plots;' and this agrees with the next verse, although it is not therefore necessarily the true exposition.—Our translation, "their habitations," is derived from מְכֹרֶה, said by some Jewish commentators to be equivalent to מְגוּר, 'a dwelling,' (see Ps. lv. 16,) or rather, a sojourning. Rashi mentions this meaning, although he prefers another. "The word denotes a sword, in Greek μάχα. Another interpretation: מְכֹרֶתֵיהֶם, in the land, מְגוּרָתָם, of their sojourning, they employed in-

struments of violence, as **מְכֹרֵתֵיךְ וּמִלְדֹדֵתֵיךְ**, (Ezek. xvi. 3,) and thus the Targum of Onkelos." In this interpretation Aben Ezra acquiesces: "in my opinion it is equivalent to **מְכֹרֵתֵיךְ** (Ezek. xvi. 3,) the **ב** being omitted." The Targum translates the clause thus: "strong men in the land of 'their sojourning,' **תְּתִבְּרֵתְהוֹן**, they exercised power."—The Vulgate version is, *vasa iniquitatis bellantia*, and Jerome says that, according to the Hebrew verity, it is *vasa iniquitatis arma eorum*. Quæ. in Gen. Tom. II. p. 545. This interpretation is founded upon the opinion, just given from Rashi, that **מִכְרָה** is the same word as *μάχαιρα* of the Greeks, and that it was introduced into their language, along with many others, from the east. See Rosenmüller in loc. and Drusius, *notæ majores*, in Crit. Sac. Tom. I. P. I. p. 1077; also Gesenius, who remarks that "this interpretation is implied by R. Elieser in Pirke Aboth," c. 38; "Jacob cursed their swords, (that is, those of Levi and Simeon,) in the Greek tongue." Upon the whole, it is probable that this version has as strong claims as any other; perhaps, indeed, it is to be preferred. It is given by Luther: *ihre Schwerdter sind mörderische Waffen*; who is followed by Rosenmüller and De Wette, the latter of whom expresses the sense in these terms: *Werkzeuge des Frevels ihre Schwerter*. Compare the language in xxxiv. 25. "Simeon and Levi took each man his *sword*."

6. **בְּסִדָּם אֵל-תִּבְּא נַפְשִׁי**. 'In their secret council enter not, my soul.' There can be no doubt that **סִדָּם** refers to the project to destroy the Shechemites, which the sons of Jacob had planned and executed, and that he intends to declare in the strongest terms his abhorrence of their conduct. But the antithesis with **קִהְיָם** in the next clause makes it most probable, that their private meeting to concert and arrange the scheme is what the word is intended to convey. This is a very usual signification of **סִדָּר**, and this may be

the meaning of *βελή* and *consilium* in the Septuagint and Vulgate.—**בְּקִרְבָּם אֶל-תַּחַר בְּבִרִי**. ‘In their assembly do not join my heart.’ **בְּבוֹר**, which literally means ‘*honor*,’ is used here, as in Ps. xvi. 9, and other places, for the noblest part of human nature; and therefore, in order to preserve the parallelism with ‘soul,’ it is best to translate it ‘heart.’* The Septuagint version of this clause is as follows: *Kαὶ ἐπὶ τῇ συστάσει αὐτῶν μὴ ἐξίσαι τὰ ἡπατὰ μου*. The translator seems to have read **אֶל-תַּחַר בְּבִרִי**; the liver being regarded by the Greeks as the seat of the passions. **תַּחַר** is the apocopated future of **תָּרַח**, to be enflamed, angry, and conveys the sense of wrathful excitement.

בִּי בְּאַפָם הָרְגוּ אִישׁ וּבְרָצֹנָם עָקְרוּ שׁוֹר. ‘For in their anger they slew men, and in their wantonness, (their wanton rage,) they destroyed a city.’ Rosenmüller takes **אִישׁ** collectively for men, that is, the males of Shechem, who were all put to death. This accords with the Syriac translation, which is plural, and it is agreeable to usage. See Judg. viii. 22. In his version of the latter clause, he follows the Septuagint, *ἐν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ αὐτῶν ἐνσχυρόκησαν ταύρους*: “in their desire, (their rash, headstrong wantonness,) “they hamstrung the oxen,” thus cruelly destroying them. Compare Josh. xi. 9. He means that portion only of the cattle which it was found impracticable to drive away, as it is certain from xxxiv. 28, 29, that what is here said cannot be understood of all. Perhaps, if this translation be admitted, **שׁוֹר** is employed figuratively to denote men of distinction,

* It is far more poetic and spirited to give to the future **תַּחַר** an imperative meaning, which is very common, than to throw the clause into a narrative form, as Gesenius has done: “in their assembly my soul was not present, (non interfuit.)” This is too tame for the elevated character of the context.

princes, like פָּר and אֲבִיר. See Ps. xxii. 13, lxviii. 31. It will then be a climax in reference to אִישׁ in the parallel clause. De Wette gives the same translation as Rosenmüller. So also Herder, in his sixth letter on the Study of Theology, p. 70: "den edlen Stier entnervten." But as it is reasonable to think that the patriarch, intending to express his detestation of his children's behavior, would not pass unnoticed the chief work of ruin, and as the history tells us that the city was destroyed, it seems preferable to adopt the reading שוֹר, 'a wall,' which has the sanction of the Chaldee, Syriac, and Vulgate versions. It will then be figurative for 'city.' עָקַר, which properly means 'to root out,' is applied in Zeph. ii. 4, to the complete destruction of a city. In Syriac this meaning is very frequent, and Michaelis, in his edition of CASTELL'S Lexicon, p. 669, 670, has given several examples, with the view of illustrating the word in the place before us. The Chaldee עָקַר is used to express the entire overthrow and ruin of nations. See Jer. i. 10, xviii. 7, or Buxtorf's Talmudic and Chaldee Lexicon, Col. 1652.—רָצוֹן is plainly to be taken in a bad sense for 'self-will, wantonness.' In order that it may correspond with the parallel word אַף, I have translated it 'wanton rage.' Dathe has, *in furore suo muros destruxerunt*.

7. אֲחֲלֶקֶם בִּיַּעֲקֹב וְאֶפִּיצֵם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל: 'I will disperse them among Jacob, and will scatter them among Israel.' As the words 'Jacob' and 'Israel' are plainly used for the nation, בִּי is best rendered by 'among.' The prophets are often said to do what they announce or predict. See Isa. vi. 10, Jer. i. 10, Hos. vi. 5. Poetry adopts the same language. Thus Silenus surrounds the sisters of Phaeton in moss, Phaetontidas musco *circumdat*, that is, he sings their transformation. Virg. Ecl. vi. 62. Compare also the use of *movit* in the Georgics, l. 123. The meaning seems to be

this : ‘although these brothers have been inseparably united by congeniality of disposition, their posterity shall not dwell contiguous in the promised land, or occupy one continuous tract, like the other tribes.’ Compare Josh. xix. 1—9, from which it seems probable, that the portion allotted to Simeon must have been small, as it had been a part of Judah’s. This is confirmed by 1 Chron. iv. 33—43. The Levites had cities appropriated to them among the rest of the tribes ; and, although in many respects the curse of their ancestor was converted into a blessing, there can be no doubt, that, during those frequent and long periods of Israelitish history when the people abandoned themselves to idolatry, the Levites were deprived of their legal rights. See Rosenmüller in loc.—It is a Jewish tradition, mentioned in the Jerusalem Targum, that multitudes of Simeon’s posterity were scattered among the other tribes in the capacity of teachers ; so that the Hebrews were accustomed to say, that every poor scribe and schoolmaster was a Simeonite. See Fagius and Drusius in Crit. Sac. Tom. I. p. 1049, 1079.

8. יְהוּדָה אֶתְּהָ יִרְדּוּךְ אַחֶיךָ. ‘Judah, thy brethren will praise thee.’ The Hebrew words for Judah and *praise* are derived from the same root. Compare Gen. xxix. 35. This leads to a paronomasia in the original which a translation cannot express. Some commentators render the words thus : ‘*thou art Judah, thy brethren will praise thee*,’ as if Jacob had said, thou art what thy name imports, and shalt be the praise and glory of thy brethren. This interpretation appears to be sanctioned by Aben Ezra ; יְהוּדָה אַתָּה כְּשִׁמְךָ “Judah (art) thee ; according to thy name, and thus shall thy brethren praise thee.” Compare πῆξρος and πῆξρα in Matt. xvi. 18. The patriarch undoubtedly alludes to the meaning of his son’s name, as he does also in the case of Dan, but it may be questioned whether the He-

brew ought to be translated, 'thou art Judah.' Most probably אֶפְיָה is pleonastic with the suffix of יְהוּדָה for *thee* simply; as הַמָּה in הִמָּה in Ps. ix. 7, 'their remembrance has perished:' where see Rosenmüller. Such pleonasms are frequent in Arabic, and not unusual in Hebrew. Compare אֲנִי בִי in 1 Sam. xxv. 24, and אֶפְיָם עִמָּכֶם in 2 Chron. xxviii. 10, and צִמְצִמְתִּי אֲנִי in Zech. vii. 5; and see SCHULTENS, Opera Min. p. 129, 130, 180, 181, 354, 355. I have therefore followed the Septuagint and Vulgate versions: Ἰούδα, σὲ ἀνέσταισαν οἱ ἀδελφοί σου. *Juda, te laudabunt fratres tui.*—יְדָךְ בְּעֶרְךָ אֲבִיבֶיךָ. 'Thy hand shall strike the backs of thine enemies.' Literally, the translation would be, 'thy hand upon the back.' As the clause is elliptical, it seems best to supply the ellipsis with some such phrase as, 'shall strike.' Compare Isa. ix. 3, (4,) where מִשֵּׁה שִׁבְמוֹ is well rendered by Gesenius, in his translation, 'the stick which strikes his back.' The word עֶרֶךְ is frequently used for *back* in the phrase, 'giving the back to pursuers,' in other words, 'putting the enemies to flight.' See Ex. xxiii. 27, Josh. vii. 8, 12. The Septuagint version is αὐτοὶ χεῖρες σου ἐπὶ νώτους. The Chaldee of Onkelos gives the general sense יְדָךְ אֶל-יְהוֹנֵקֶךָ, 'thy hand shall prevail against thine enemies.' The patriarch announces to Judah, that his posterity shall be victorious over their foes. In the next clause he declares, that their superiority shall be acknowledged by the respect and submission of all the other tribes.

9. גִּיּוֹר אֲרִיָּה וְהוֹדָה מִשְׁתָּךְ בְּנִי עָלוּת פָּרַע רַבֵּץ פְּאִרְיָה. 'A lion's whelp is Judah. From the prey, my son, thou hast gone up! He bent, couched down like a lion, and like a roaring lion: who will rouse him!' The boldness and strength of the tribe are still the subject in the mind of the prophet, which he expresses in figurative

language usual among the Hebrew poets. See Deut. xxxiii. 20. It may be observed, that there is a gradation in the use of the metaphor here employed. First, the comparison is to a lion's whelp, then to a full grown lion, and lastly to the same animal, whose fierceness is denoted by his terrific roar. Several commentators understand by the word לְבִיָּא a lioness, whose fierceness, especially when protecting her young, is appalling. The change of person makes the description very graphical and nervous, and is quite poetic. Some interpreters explain עֲלִיתָ by 'increasing, growing strong.' Thus Dathe : crevisti ex præda; and De Wette, vom Raube wirst du wachsen. If this interpretation be admitted, the expression will denote that increase of strength which the posterity of Judah should acquire by the successful results of warlike enterprise. Most probably, it refers to the lion's going up to his lair in the mountains after having seized upon his prey, and conveys this meaning : 'thou wilt return victor to thy [secure and impregnable] dwelling, bearing off the spoils of the enemy.' Thus Rosenmüller in loc.

10. לֹא-יִסּוּר שְׁבֶט מִיְהוּדָה וּמִחֶקֶק מִיַּיִן רִגְלָיו עַד . בִּי-יִבָּא שִׁילֹה וְלֹא יִקָּהַת עַמִּים :
 'Authority shall not depart from Judah, neither shall he want a lawgiver, until he comes to whom (it belongs), and him the nations shall obey.'

The interest which has always been attached to this verse, must be my apology for more than ordinary particularity, and before I examine its meaning, I must be allowed to give the most important of the ancient versions. The Septuagint and Vulgate are omitted; as, whatever they contain which has a bearing on the principal topic of the prophecy will be produced under the exegetical discussion, and they are readily accessible. I add also the original authorities, that the reader may not be obliged to depend on the translations.

Chaldee Targum of Onkelos. לֹא-יֵעָרֵי עֶבֶר שׁוֹלֵטִין מִדְּבִית יְהוּדָה וְסֹפְרָא מִבְּנֵי-בְנוֹתָי עַד-עֲלָמָא עַד-דְּיִיתֵי מְשִׁיחָא דְּדִלִיָּהּ הִיא מְלָכוּתָא וְלִיָּהּ וְשִׁתְמַעִין עִמָּמָא :
 “One that exercises authority shall not depart from the house of Judah, nor a scribe from his children’s children forever, until Messiah comes, whose (literally, *who of him*.) is the kingdom, and whom (lit. *him*.) the nations shall obey.”

Jerusalem Targum. לֹא פִסְקִין מְלָכִין מִדְּבִית יְהוּדָה אֶת לֹא סֹפְרִין מִלְּפִי אֲוִרְתָּא מִבְּנֵי בְנוֹי עַד זְמַן דְּיִיתֵי מְלָכָא מְשִׁיחָא דְּדִינִיָּהּ הִיא מְלָכוּתָא וְלִיָּהּ עֲתִידִין דְּוִשְׁתַּעֲבָדוּן :
 “Kings shall not cease from the house of Judah, nor scholars, (or, *skilful*) teachers of the law, from his children’s children, until the time that king Messiah comes, whose is the kingdom, and whom all the kingdoms of the earth are about to serve.”

The Samaritan Pentateuch agrees with the Hebrew, except in reading יבוא, דגליו, שלה. “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor *one that gives the law* from his (literally, *from between his*.) standards, until שלה comes, and to him the nations shall assemble.”

Syriac version. לֹא יִסְרֹף מִן מִלְּכֻתָּא. וְסֹפְרָא מִבְּנֵי בְנוֹתָי עַד-עֲלָמָא עַד-דְּיִיתֵי מְשִׁיחָא דְּדִינִיָּהּ הִיא מְלָכוּתָא וְלִיָּהּ עֲתִידִין דְּוִשְׁתַּעֲבָדוּן :
 “The sceptre shall not remove from Judah, nor an interpreter from between his feet, until he comes whose it is, and for him will the nations wait.”

To this view of the most important versions, I add a translation of the commentary of Rashi, and the principal portions of that of Aben Ezra, adhering as closely to the phraseology of these writers, as the English idiom will allow. Rashi comments thus. “The sceptre shall not

depart from Judah. From David and afterwards. These are the heads of the captivity in Babylonia, who rule the people with the sceptre, who are governors appointed by royal authority. Nor a lawgiver from between his feet. These are scholars, princes of Israel, say the rabbins. Until Shiloh come. King Messiah, whose is the kingdom, שִׁלּוֹ, and thus Onkelos. But the Midrash Agada," (old rabbinical interpretation,) "explains it by שִׁי לֹר, as it is said: יוֹבִילוּ שִׁי לְמוֹרָא (‘let them bring *presents* to him that is to be feared.’ Ps. lxxvi. 12.) And to him shall the יִקְהֶה of the people be. The gathering (אִסְיֹפֶת) of the people: for the י is radical." [Then follow some remarks on radicals and serviles, after which he proceeds thus.] "יִקְהֶה עַמִּים, the gathering of the people, as it is said, ‘to him shall the nations seek,’ (Isa. xi. 10;) and like it, (is Prov. xxx. 17,) ‘the eye that mocketh its father and despiseth the *gathering* of its mother,’ (וַתִּבְּזֶה לִיקְהֶה,) the *collecting* of wrinkles on her face before her old age." (!!) He then refers to the use of the word קָהָה in the Talmud. See Buxtorf's Lexicon, col. 1983.

Aben Ezra. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah. The sceptre, great men, shall not depart from Judah, until David comes, who was the beginning of the kingdom of Judah:’ (that is, as Cartwright explains it, the first king of the tribe of Judah.) "And the fact was so. Is it not seen that the standard of Judah sets out first? The Lord says indeed, ‘let Judah go up first;’" (referring to Judg. i. 1, 2.) "And the meaning of מִחֹקֶק is scribe, because *he writes* (יִחְרוֹק) in books: and the sense of *between his feet* is" (shown from this,) "that it was the custom of every scribe to sit between the feet of the elder. —Shiloh: some say, according to the way in which the Syriac translator explains it, that it is of the same import

as שֵׁלֹה." [He then proceeds to give some other views; such as, (1) the name of the place Shiloh, יְבוֹא being used for declining, as it is applied to the sun going down, and thus the meaning will be, until Shiloh come to an end or decline, referring to Ps. lxxviii. 60, 'he forsook the tabernacle of 'Shiloh,' after which it follows in v. 70, 'he chose David his servant'; (2) שֵׁלֹה for בְּנוֹ, the ה for ו and שֵׁלֹה in the sense of offspring, from embryo or second birth. יְקָהָה he explains like Rashi, and refers to the authority exercised by David and Solomon. He remarks also, that the phrase *until* does not imply a departure of the sceptre at the time contemplated;] "but its meaning is like, 'bread shall not fail to such an one until the time comes that he shall have many fields and vineyards'; like, 'I will not leave thee, until I have done what I have spoken to thee,' that is, that he would bring him back to the land." (See Gen. xxviii. 15.)

The first word to be examined in this passage is שֵׁבֶט. Its general sense is that of *rod* or *staff*; and hence it is applied, figuratively, to *punishment*, *correction*, and to a *ruler* of whose office it was the badge. It is used also for a *tribe*. Its other significations have no bearing on its meaning here. It cannot be employed in the third sense, for it would be exceedingly frigid to say that a tribe should not depart from itself. Neither can the word *tribe* be intended to express the *characteristics* and *peculiarities* of a tribe, so as to give the sense, that Judah should not cease to be a tribe, should not lose its character as such, until &c.; for no use of the word supports such a signification. Some Jews of comparatively modern date, understand it in the first of the above mentioned senses, and explain the declaration thus; the 'Jews shall be an afflicted people, and exposed to the oppression of tyranny until the coming of the Messiah.' But this cannot be the meaning: for the

text speaks of authority resident in the tribe itself, not of foreign control; and the context is altogether at variance with the supposition of oppression.* There can be no reasonable doubt, that it is used in the second of the above senses. 1. This is not only a very common meaning of שֵׁבֶט, but the whole phrase is used to express the loss of a nation's authority, in Zech. x. 11. שֵׁבֶט מִצְרַיִם יָסוּר, 'the sceptre of Egypt shall depart.' 2. The antithesis with מִחֶקֶק requires this sense. This word is used for *lawgiver* in Deut. xxxiii. 21, and elsewhere, and the antithesis is sufficiently preserved by translating it so in this place. I do not, therefore, see sufficient reason to render it, with De Wette and Gesenius, *staff of authority, sceptre*, thus making it express the very same shade of meaning as שֵׁבֶט; for although this is often, it is not necessarily, the case with Hebrew parallelisms, the different members of which frequently mark species of the same genus. 3. The context, which speaks of Judah's power and superiority, will not admit any other sense; and lastly, this is supported by the ancient versions, of which the Septuagint has ἄρχων — ἡγέμενος, and the Vulgate, *sceptrum—dux*.

מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו. Many commentators explain this phrase as an euphemism. This is the opinion of Rosenmüller, who refers to Deut. xxviii. 57, and to the *similar* phrase in Gen. xlv. 26, Ex. i. 5, Jud. viii. 30; and this is the idea of the Septuagint and Vulgate versions; ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ: de femore ejus. It is observable, however, that the first of the places referred to speaks of the *female*, and the others, although they have in view the male, use the word רֵגֶל, *the thigh*. There is therefore a difference in the texts, and they cannot be adduced as examples of analogous *expression*, although

* This view is fully refuted by Fagius, Drusius, and Cartwright, in the Critici Sacri, Col. 1051, 1068, 1105.

they may be analogous in the general idea. Gesenius, under לְךָ 4, c), follows the Targums: "from the seed, offspring, posterity." Ernesti compares the phrase with ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν ἀποχρῆσθαι, used by Plato, and ἐκ ποδῶν ἀπέχουσαι, by Xenophon, both equivalent to *e medio discedere* or simply *abire* of the Latins, 'to go out,' remarking that the Hebrews were accustomed to use various members of the body for *the whole man*. See Rosenmüller in loc. Also Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, I. p. 70, Keith's Translation, p. 58. To the instances there given, it may be added, that we say in English, 'I received at *your hands*,' meaning '*from you*.' Whatever may be the idea on which the use of the phrase is founded, there can be no doubt respecting its general meaning, which is equivalent to *from him*, that is, the tribe of Judah.

כִּי וְעַד. I have retained the meaning which is usually given to this phrase, *until*, because this is the only meaning which it has in the Bible. It is used but four times, exclusive of the text: Gen. xxvi. 13, xli, 49, 2 Sam. xxiii. 10, 2 Chron. xxvi. 15. Some interpreters translate it *as long as*; and this is the version of Dathe, who thinks that the parallelism is not given with sufficient accuracy by *until*, as this verse, like the next, evidently consists of two hemistichs, the clauses of which correspond with each other. His translation is as follows: "Non deerunt reges Judææ, — nec legesatores. — Quamdiu prolem habebit, — ei gentes obedient." He remarks also that וְעַד and כִּי וְעַד do not always express the *limits* of time, but mark also its *duration*; and that by giving it this sense here, the last hemistich, like the first, will consist of two corresponding members. This view of the text he derived from Gulcher's *explicatio novæ et facilis loci*. Gen. xlix. 10. — Although it be granted that Dathe's version does place the parallelism in a stronger light than the ordinary translation, it may be

doubted whether this circumstance should have so much weight as to counterbalance the sense in which עַד כִּי is always used. It is certain, that so nice an adjustment of the parallel clauses as is frequently to be met with in Hebrew poetry does not characterize *the whole* of this prophecy of Jacob, and therefore need not be required *in this verse*: the common translation exhibits as much of this quality as can be discovered in some other verses. To the objection drawn from the meaning of עַד כִּי, he thinks it sufficient to reply with Gulcher, that the phrase does not occur often enough to admit of a rule being founded upon it, and that עַד appended to כִּי, and other particles, does not alter their meaning: hence he concludes that it is nothing more than an expletive, like the Greek *av*.—What force these remarks would be entitled to, if the usual signification of עַד כִּי presented an insuperable difficulty in ascertaining the sense of the clause, it is unnecessary to examine. It suits the passage under consideration as well as the others in which it is found, and therefore it has been adopted by all the ancient versions.* Some modern Jews have endeavored to give to עַד the meaning of *forever*. They have understood the text, either as asserting the perpetuity of Judah's authority when the Messiah shall have come, (see Fagius in loc. Crit. Sac. p. 1052,) or, as declaring that the want of authority shall not be permanent, because he is to come to restore it to the tribe. See DAVID LEVI's *Lingua Sacra* in עַד. The word עַד is indeed used

* The Chaldee of Onkelos need not be considered as an exception to this statement. This version is as follows: עַד-עַלְמָא עַד-דִּינִיחֵי מְשִׁיחָא. Here עַד-דִּינִיחֵי is the translation of עַד כִּי-יָבֹא, and עַד-עַלְמָא, is, as well as מְשִׁיחָא, added by the interpreter, and intended perhaps as an exegetical paraphrase.

to express *perpetuity*, but never, as in this place, followed by כִּי*, and generally connected with some adjunct, as for instance, לְעֶדְיָם וְעַד, לְעֶדְיָם עַד, לְעֶדְיָם, and others. If Isa. lvii. 15, may be considered as an exception, the meaning is different, and the place may be rendered adverbially, thus : ‘who sits (on the throne) eternally.’—This Jewish interpretation, being founded altogether on difficulties arising out of doctrinal views, may be passed over without any further remark.

The word שִׁילָה, which is next to be examined, has given rise to more discussion than any other in the prophecy. The first point which must be investigated relates to the genuine reading. The varieties which appear in manuscripts are שִׁילָה, שִׁלָּה, שִׁילֹר, שִׁלֹר; the two last occur in but few. Jahn, who has examined this subject in his Einleitung, Theil. I. § 148, says, that the oldest testimony in favor of the reading שִׁילָה is the Targum of the Pseudo Jonathan, which is not of higher antiquity than the seventh or eighth century; and that the evidence of even this witness is doubtful, inasmuch as his translation, “the least” or “youngest of his sons,” is too vague to enable us to determine whether he read שִׁילָה or שִׁלָּה. The former, however, appears in most Hebrew manuscripts, and in almost all the editions. But as both editions and manuscripts are comparatively modern, other authorities more ancient must

* The assertion of Levi is somewhat extraordinary, and not very critical, that “according to the common translation, and which all Christians seem to have adopted, the adverb כִּי, *because*, stands for a *cypher* in the text, as no word is given for it.” Would he require every particle in a Hebrew phrase to have a correspondent term in the vernacular tongue? עַד כִּי is the phrase for *until*, and if two words are required to express its meaning, the rather inelegant phrase *until that* will meet his objection.

be examined. 1. All the manuscripts of the Samaritan text read **שלה**, and this reading is preserved in the Samaritan version. 2. The Septuagint translation, τὰ ἀποσείμμενα *δυτῶ*, according to some copies, with which Theodotion agrees, and *ὧ ἀπόσειστο* according to others, with which Aquila and Symmachus coincide, may have been obtained from **שלה** but not from **שילה**. 3. These Greek readings are supported by Justin Martyr, both in his apology and dialogue with Trypho, and also by Epiphanius and Theodoret. 4. The translator of the Peshito, Onkelos, and the author of the Jerusalem Targum, appear to have read **שלה**, as their versions are a paraphrase of this word. 5. In the former part of the tenth century the reading **שילה** does not seem to have been known in Egypt and Babylon and the adjacent countries; for the Egyptian Saadiah, the Gaon, who was for two years master of the school of Babylon or Seleucia, translated according to the reading **שלה**. Jahn, from whom chiefly this view of the evidence is taken, tells us, that in a manuscript writing at the end of the thirteenth century **שלה** is found as a correction; from which it is clear, that some standard manuscripts, (compare his Introduction, P. I. § iii. p. 131, of the Translation,) by which the correctors were governed, contained that reading. Others, however, of the same class, read **שילה**, for in three manuscripts of the thirteenth century it is a correction of **שלה**, and in another of **שלו**. Such corrections were increased about this period, and in the fourteenth century the reading **שילה** became pretty common, and in the next was more generally extended, among manuscripts. The external evidence therefore is (he thinks,) decidedly in favor of **שלה**, and this reading is as well sustained by the internal as the other, if not better. In addition to Jahn, as above referred to, see W. F. HUFNAGEL's Versuch über 1 Mos. xlix. 10, in the Re-

portorium für Biblische und Morgenlandische Litteratur, Theil XIV. p. 240—242.

In one point of view, the insertion of the yod is of very little consequence, as the word may have the same meaning without as it has with it: in the one case, it will be fully, in the other imperfectly written; שִׁילִיָּה and שִׁלָּה are identical in meaning. But, in another point of view, the introduction of the yod is important, as an interpretation which the word may bear without it, could not be elicited, if it were written with the yod inserted. Hengstenberg remarks, that “the defenders of the interpretation” alluded to “fall into an error, when they conclude, from the fact that the old translators adopted this pointing, that it was the received one in their time.” He supposes it “most likely, that they found the present pointing of the word as the received one, but felt obliged to depart from it, because, according to it, they could give to the word no suitable derivation, while, on the contrary, the pointing which they adapted, (שִׁלָּה,) agreed with the traditional reference of the passage to the Messiah.” Christology, Keith’s Translation, p. 55. He admits, then, that the old translators could not derive the meaning which tradition had stamped on the text, without assuming the reading which Jahn maintains to be the true one. Is it not vastly more probable, that this was actually the reading which they found? The meaning which this reading sanctions, Hengstenberg allows to have been the traditionary one received before “the old translators,” in other words, the authors of the Targums and of the Septuagint, lived. Its very high antiquity, therefore, is admitted. If the reading שִׁילָּה were the prevailing one before the times of these translators, whence arose the traditionary meaning, which induced them to change this reading into שִׁלָּה, in order to adapt the word to the current interpretation?

The meaning of the word must now be considered.

1. A few expositors have regarded it as the name of a place, as the word שִׁלֹה is used in Judg. xxi. 12, 1 Sam. iv. 12, and elsewhere, and have translated the passage thus: "until he come to *Shiloh*;" and an allusion to the meaning of the word שִׁלֹה, *to be at rest*, has been supposed to be intended. The meaning will then be, that the tribe of Judah should enjoy the precedence until they came to their rest in the land of Canaan, at which time the others separated from this, (which had previously occupied the first rank in the march, Num. x. 14,) in order to receive their own portion. Against this interpretation, it is sufficient to remark, that it is altogether too feeble for the elevated predictions of the context, and that it wants coherence with the following expressions. Shiloh being a city within the limits of Ephraim, did not belong to the tribe of Judah, and the connexion between it and the authority of that tribe, is at best remote and incidental, while it has none at all with the obedience of the nations, which is immediately afterwards predicted. The same objections, with others also, may be urged against the exposition of Rabbi Samuel, the son of Meir, which is given by Mendelsohn, and defended by the Dubnian commentator in the דרך סלולה. "Until he come to Shiloh, (לְשִׁילָה for שִׁילָה, as in 1 Chron. xviii. 7, Jer. xxiv. 1, and xxviii. 3,) that is to say, until there come a king of Judah, Rehoboam the son of Solomon, who came to renew the kingdom of Shiloh which is near to Shechem. But then the tribes will depart from him and will make Jeroboam king, and only Judah and Benjamin shall be left to Rehoboam, the son of Solomon." The latter part of the verse he explains of the subjection of the surrounding nations to Solomon, (1 Kings iv. 24,) and of Israel's flocking to Shechem to crown Rehoboam; (2 Chron. x. 1.) To prove the proximity of Shechem to

Shiloh, he refers to Josh. xxiv. 1, 26, "the sanctuary of the Lord" mentioned in the latter text, being then at Shiloh, as is evident from Judges xxi. 19, and Jer. xli. 5.

2. Dathe, with other critics of great name, compares שָׁלָה with an Arabic word denoting the membrane which envelops the fœtus, and then explains it as a metonymy for offspring, referring to שָׁלָה in Deut. xxviii. 57, and remarking that בֵּשׂ is used in relation to birth. See Ps. lxxi. 18. Thus his translation is: "*quamdiu prolem habebit.*" Concerning this interpretation it is well observed by Le Clere, that it is a conjecture founded on no firmer basis than the slender affinity of the terms embryo, second birth, and offspring, which is entirely too slight to support it. Besides, can any reason be given why this word should be employed in so unusual a sense, in preference to בֵּן or יָרֵעַ, which are commonly used to denote posterity.

3. The Vulgate version is, *donce veniat qui mittendus est*. Jerome either used a manuscript which contained the reading שָׁלָה, *sent*, or he mistook the ה for a ח. The latter supposition is the more probable, for, as Jahn remarks, *ubi sup.* p. 508, this might easily be done, owing to the similarity of the letters, the smallness of the characters in his copy, and the weakness of his eyes, of which he complains; and because he has actually made this mistake in Gen. x. 24, by commuting שָׁלָה with שָׁלַח.

4. Rosenmüller considers the term as an appellative from שָׁלָה, to be at rest, analogous to קִיטוֹר *smoke*, from קָטַר, and makes it equivalent to *tranquility*, that is, *the author of tranquility*, the *peace maker*, like יִשְׁבֵּט *sceptre*, for *he who holds it*, that is, *the ruler*. Thus the word will be synonymous with שֹׁרֵר שָׁלוֹם, *prince of peace*, in Isa. ix. 5, and with שְׁלֹמֹה, *Solomon*, that is, *the peaceable*, (see 1. Chron. xxii. 9,) to whom the Samaritans apply the pro-

phcey. Hengstenberg adopts this view. He does not hesitate to say, that “every thing is in favor of this interpretation, and that nothing can be said against it.” Christology, I. p. 67, 8. But I think it involves difficulties which have never been satisfactorily solved. Whether שִׁלָּה or שְׁלָה will bear this translation is somewhat doubtful, as this word is never used for *tranquility*, but שְׁלָה. That other similar forms do occur, as these two critics show, only proves that the word would be in analogy with other words really existing; it by no means proves that there was such a word. And as a state of peaceful and happy security is expressed by שְׁלוֹם, (Gen. xxviii. 21,) and as שְׁקָט is used to denote the enjoyment of such a state, (Judg. viii. 28;) it is difficult to conceive why a term which occurs no where else should be used here to convey the same idea, and also why this term, once employed in this sense, should never have been used by subsequent writers, particularly by Isaiah in the place referred to. It is possible, indeed, that the word may contain an intended allusion to this meaning, and thus be considered as a sort of paronomasia, so favorite a figure with the Hebrew writers.

5. The word שְׁלָה seems to be a term compounded of the prefix ש, a particle from אֲשֶׁר and equivalent to it, meaning *who*, and לָהּ for לֹו to him; that is, literally, ‘who (there is) to him, he to whom,’ and the sentence to be elliptical for—until *he* comes *whose* (it is), namely, the authority implied in the word *sceptre* and recognised by the expectation of those to whom the prophecy was directed. Thus שְׁלוֹ will be equivalent to אֲשֶׁר-לֹו, literally, ‘whom to him,’ and אֲשֶׁר-לֹו is similar to אֲשֶׁר-בְּךָ literally, ‘whom in thee,’ in Isa. xlix. 3. This does appear to be the view in which Ezekiel regarded the passage, if, as seems

exceedingly probable, he has paraphrased it in xxi. 32, (27.) עַד-בֹּא אֲשֶׁר-לֹ הַמִּשְׁפָּט ‘until he comes to whom the right belongs.’ Hengstenberg allows it to be undeniable “ that Ezekiel had this passage in view ; but there is no objection, (he thinks,) to understand the words, ‘he whose is the dominion,’ as a paraphrase of Shiloh, regarded as a name of the Messiah, according to the interpretation” just considered. It cannot indeed be denied that the appellation ‘peace’ or ‘peacemaker,’ is not at variance with the periphrasis, “he whose is the dominion ;” for the establishment of peace is quite consistent with the idea of supremacy. Still there is no necessary connexion between the two, and the “paraphrase” of Ezekiel could be no more than an incidental result from the original expression of Jacob. According to the view which I am endeavoring to defend, “the traditionary reference,” which, on the supposition that the common punctuation שִׁלֹּה is the true one, was inexplicable to the “old translators,” who, therefore, “felt obliged to depart from it,” and to adopt the reading שָׁלוֹה, is as old at least as the time of Ezekiel, and is given by him in his paraphrase.

The objection urged against this analysis of the word is that שׁ is not used in this way in early Hebrew writings. To this it may be replied, that it is so used in Judg. v. 7, שָׁקַמְתִּי ‘that I arose’ ; in Canticles i. 7, twice, once with a sægol שֶׁאֶהְבָּה ‘whom (my soul) loveth,’ and again with a patach שֶׁלָּמָה ‘for why’ ; and in viii. 12, שְׁלִי ‘which is mine.’ Eccles. i. 9, affords several examples of this usage : מֶה-שֶׁהָיָה הָיָה וּמֶה-שֶׁנַּעֲשֶׂה הָיָה וְשֶׁנֶּעְשֶׂה. It occurs also in Job xix. 29 : “that ye may know שֶׁהָיָה or שֶׁהָיָה that (there is) a judgment ;” and perhaps in Gen. vi. 3, בְּשָׁגָם. This word is explained in the old versions as a particle

compounded of בִּי , שֵׁ and גַּם , meaning ‘because, in that indeed,’ although some modern critics consider it as the infinitive Piel of שָׁגַג or שָׁגָה to err, with an affix and a prefix. See Gesenius in שָׁגַג ; also Rosenmüller and Dathe in loc., the former of whom translates it ‘dum errare eos facit caro,’ and the latter, ‘propter errores suos.’ But if it were certain that שֵׁ is not found in this sense in the Pentateuch, it would not follow that it was never so used in Hebrew writings of equal antiquity, but only that it was not common. It is remarked by Jahn, that it is by no means surprising that Jacob, who lived so long in Mesopotamia among the Syrians, should have availed himself of a prefix which corresponds with the Aramæan Daleth. Hengstenberg, while he takes notice of the objection, candidly allows that it “is not of itself sufficient;” but he remarks, “that the supposed ellipsis is so unnatural that scarcely an analogous example can be found.” p. 56. The weight to be attached to such an objection as this depends very much on individual feeling. I can only express my surprise that any one should be pressed by such a difficulty. The ellipsis is merely of the substantive verb: “until he come, whom (it is) to him,” is the literal translation, according to the view under consideration. The word which Ezekiel introduces is not necessary to complete the sense; his paraphrase only makes it plainer, and this accords with prophetic analogy. The use of לֹא for לִי is according to the orthography of עִירוֹ for עִירָה , and כִּתְּתָה the chethib for כִּתְּתֵר in the next verse.

This view of the word שֹׁלָה is sanctioned by the ancient versions. The Greek, $\tilde{\omega}\ \alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\alpha\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron$, ‘for whom it is reserved,’ or, $\tau\alpha\ \alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, ‘the things reserved for him,’ supply in part the ellipsis, and evidently refer to some person or authority, or both, expected to come in a future age. To

the same purpose the Targum of Onkelos, which is still more paraphrastic, and which seems to have had in view the text in Ezekiel: "until the Messiah comes, whose is the kingdom." Thus also the Syriac and other oriental versions, which, as they agree with the Targum, show that this last phrase is not a Jewish addition, but an intended paraphrase of שָׁלוֹם.

Whether this analysis of the word be well founded or not, there is strong reason to believe that the passage does relate to the Messiah: and it is not impossible that the word employed may have been intended to allude to him as the author of *peace and quiet felicity*. This is merely a *conjecture*; but it is worthy of some consideration, as in this very chapter such an allusion is contained in the nineteenth verse, where Gad, גַּד, which properly signifies 'good luck,' (see the Septuagint ἐν εὐτυχίᾳ in Gen. xxx. 11,) is connected with גִּדְדִּיר, 'a troop,' and in v. 29, there is a paronomasia of יִנְחֵם, 'shall comfort,' with נָח, which means 'rest.*' To use the language of Rosenmüller: "promittitur itaque tribui Judæ, non recessurum ab eo imperium, donec veniat magnus ille princeps, qui extremo mundi ævo turbata omnia ad pacem et tranquillitatem sit revocaturus, et totius orbis terrarum imperium sit suscepturus."

Such a view of this text, which makes it a prediction of the coming Messiah, coincides with the patriarchal history and promises. The annunciation made in paradise of "a descendant of the woman" who was to destroy the power

* Compare Gesenius under יִשְׁרָיִן, which, he thinks, may "imply an allusion to the signification of *right, uprightness*, contained in the root יִשַׁר," while he supposes it "not improbable, that it was a diminutive form of the name יִשְׁרָאֵל." Robinson's Translation, p. 454.

of the devil, the frequent repetition of the promise to Abraham, that in his posterity "all nations should be blessed," are entirely in unison with this interpretation of Jacob's much celebrated prophecy. And the imperfect knowledge which at that period existed of the nature and character of the Messiah's kingdom, will account for the obscurity and apparent indefiniteness of the term under which he is represented. In this declaration, then, the authority of government and legislation is promised to the tribe of Judah until the coming of the Messiah: and, although the *Israelites* ceased to be a distinct nation at the time of the Assyrian captivity, yet the *Jews*, who were the descendants of that tribe, continued with occasional interruptions and oppressions to enjoy their own government until the coming of JESUS CHRIST. Then indeed the sceptre did not depart, although the visible and secular rule soon became extinct; it was made permanent in his person, agreeably to the idea illustrated by Aben Ezra, as before cited.* "His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and of his dominion there shall be no end."

It has been supposed by Eusebius and other very respectable writers, that "the sceptre departed from Judah" on the accession of Herod, who is called "a foreigner," and who was not of Jewish extraction. But the fact does not warrant the conclusion. The Jewish nation still retained the right of self-government. The exercise of the sceptre was indeed restricted, but not taken away. Herod's government was Jewish government, and was regulated by Jewish laws. As well might it be said, that the Roman power ceased whenever some foreign adventurer succeeded in mounting the throne of the Cæsars; or that the sceptre

* Hengstenberg defends this view. See p. 59.

departed from the French nation, when the Corsican became their emperor. The civil rights of the Jewish people were controlled by the influence of the Romans, but they were not entirely taken away until the overthrow of the nation. Vitranga has written a very satisfactory dissertation on this subject in his *Observationes Sacræ*, Lib. IV. cap. v. vii. p. 934–960.

: יִקְהָה עַמִּים. The Septuagint has, καὶ αὐτος προσδοκία ἐσται, which is followed by the Vulgate, ‘et ipse erit expectatio gentium.’ To the same purpose the Syriac version. The translators seem to have taken the word as a derivative from קָהָה, which in Piel means ‘to expect.’ Perhaps the reading in their copies was obtained from that root.—Others render יִקְהָה, ‘congregatio,’ “gathering,” after the Samaritan, which reads יִקְהָה, and which the Samaritan translation explains by יִתְנַגְדּוּן, ‘shall place themselves (shall stand,) before.’ This is also the translation of Rashi, as I have before shown.—Most probably it is derived from an Arabic root, meaning ‘to obey,’ and signifies obedience. This sense suits the only other place in which the word occurs in Scripture, Prov. xxx. 17. It is the interpretation of the best critics, and is supported by the Chaldee of Onkelos, וְלִיהוֹ יִשְׁתַּמְעוּן עַמִּמֶּיךָ, ‘and him shall the nations obey.’

11. אֶסְרִי לִגְפֶן עֵינִי וְלִשְׂרָקָה בְּנִי אֶתְנֹו. ‘He fastens to the vine his ass’s foal, and to the choice vine the son of his ass.’ אֶסְרִי is poetical for אֶסֶר, the י being paragogic. Thus also in בְּנִי, which the Vulgate has considered as a pronominal suffix, translating “o fili mi.” שְׂרָקָה is the same as שֶׁרֶק in Isa. v. 2, a very superior species of vine, which is called at the present day in Morocco *serki*. The extraordinary fertility of Judah’s portion in the promised land is here announced: vines of the finest sort shall be so common that travellers shall use them for hedges and fences

to fasten their asses to.—The same idea is expressed in the next clause in language highly figurative and poetical: ‘He washes in wine his garments and in the blood of grapes his vesture.’ כִּסְוָה is derived by Aben Ezra from the same source as מִסְכָּה in Ex. xxxiv. 33, 34, 35, a veil, covering, and made equivalent to it. But it is generally considered as imperfectly written by an aphæresis for כְּסוּוֹת, as the full reading occurs in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Although no instance can be produced of the elision of כ, yet כִּסְוָה for כְּסוּוֹת, כִּסְוָה for כְּסוּוֹת, are thought to be analogous examples. See Gesenius in verb. and de Pent. Sam. p. 33. He is mistaken, however, in ascribing this view of the word to the Jewish commentator above named. “Ita Aben Ezra, qui scribit: כִּסְוָה כְּמֹד כְּסוּוֹת וְחֹסֶר כֶּפֶס.” It is true he does so write, but he introduces the remark with the words, וְיָדָא (that is, וְיָדָא, ‘some say that it is;’ and immediately adds, וְהִנֵּכֶן בְּעֵינַי שֶׁהוּא מִגְזֹר מִסְכָּה, ‘but it is clear to me that it is from the same source as מִסְכָּה.’

12. חֲבִלְיָלִי עֵינָיו מִיַּיִן וְלֶבָן-שָׁנִים מִחֶלֶב: ‘Sparkling are his eyes with wine, and white are his teeth with milk.’ Although חֲבִלְיָלִי עֵינָיו is used in reference to an intemperate use of wine, (see Prov. xxiii. 29,) yet it is unnecessary, and would be at variance with the nature of the subject, to extend the meaning of the word here any further than to denote abundance. Compare the use of שִׁכָּר in Gen. xliii. 34. Profusion of wine and milk seems plainly to be the idea conveyed, and this is closely connected with the former verse.—The Septuagint, χαρροποιὸι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ οἶνον, καὶ λευκοὶ οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ ἢ γάλα, followed by the Vulgate, ‘pulchriores sunt oculi ejus vino, et dentes ejus lacte candidiores, more joyous are his eyes than wine, and whiter his teeth than milk,’ is beautifully expressive of the felicitous condi-

tion of Judah. Saadiah gives the same version. Whiter than milk, is also a proverbial expression. See Drusius in loc., notæ majores. But the other translation is probably more correct, as it suits the context rather better, which plainly gives the idea of great plenty.

13. זְבוּלֹן לְחוֹף יָמִים יִשְׁכֵּן וְהוּא לְחוֹף אֲנִיֹּת וַיִּרְכָּתוּ : עַל-צִידָן : 'Zebulon will dwell on the sea coast, a coast well lined with ships, his territories reach unto Zidon.' In our English translation חוֹף is rendered "haven." Its general meaning is undoubtedly *coast* or *shore*, or *side*, and so it is constantly translated. See Deut. i. 7, Josh. ix. 1, Judg. v. 17, Jer. xlvii. 7, Ezek. xxv. 16; which, exclusive of the text, are the only places in which the word occurs. Dathe thinks it should have the meaning of *haven* in the second clause of the verse; but as Rosenmüller's interpretation is simple and easy, and retains the usual sense of the word, I have adopted it in the preceding translation. "Erit ipse ad littus navium, id est, habitabit ad littus semper navibus frequens. lxx. *κία αὐτὸς παρ' ὅρου πλοίων.*" The country of Zebulon extended from the sea of Tiberias to the Mediterranean, and along the latter as far as Zidon, that is, according to Bochart, to Phœnicia. See his Phaleg, Lib. IV. cap. 34. p. 302.

14. יִשָּׁכֵר חֲמֹר נָרָם רֹבֵץ בֵּין הַמִּשְׁפָּתִים : 'Issachar is a strong ass, lying down within his borders.' Thus Homer compares Ajax to an ass,

ὦς δ' ὅτ' ὄνος παρ' ἄλυσαν ἰωνεβίσσατο παῖδας

Νωβίης, ὦς τότ' ἔπειτα Ἀιαντα μέγαν καὶ τα α.

Il. xi. 557, 562. Cowper's translation, 672 ss. The chief difficulty in the verse lies in the word מִשְׁפָּתִים. The Septuagint translates it *κλῆροι*, the Vulgate *termini*, and the Chaldee of Onkelos תְּהוֹמֵימָר, 'boundaries, borders.' Thus it would be a regular derivative from שָׁפַת, 'to place.' Many of

the modern commentators, following Michaelis, derive it from the Arabic word *سَفَتَر*, and explain it by ‘water troughs’ or ‘canals for cattle.’ Thus Dathe and De Wette. But Gesenius remarks that the “root is not used of every kind of drink, but only of such as is hurtful, which does not quench thirst but augments it.” Consequently it is not admissible to derive the Hebrew word from it. Rosenmüller also says that the Arabians use it in reference to unwholesome food, both meat and drink. He follows the old versions, and interprets the word of the *two borders* by which one part of a field or country is separated from another adjacent to it. This is probably the best course to be pursued by an interpreter, when the data for ascertaining the signification of a term are so imperfect.—The whole verse, he thinks, expresses the servile character of the tribe, and their quiet enjoyment of their own district, as well as their attachment to agricultural pursuits. This is plainly supported by the next verse.

16, 17. : *דָּן יִרְיֶן עִמּוֹ כְּאַחַד שְׁבֵטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל*. ‘Dan will rule his people like one of the tribes of Israel;’ that is, he will maintain his rank among them. There is a *paronomasia* in the first two words, which a translation cannot express. The common English translation of *יִרְיֶן* in the Old Testament, and of *κρίνειν* in the New, is ‘to judge,’ which in some cases is a very proper term. But as these words are frequently used in the sense of ‘governing, ruling,’ as is also the corresponding word *שָׁפַט*, (see 1 Sam. ii. 10, viii. 5; Isa. xl. 23,) I have preferred the more general expression. The sentiment expressed in the verse appears to be this, that Dan will be as able as any other of the tribes to advance his own interests and to govern himself by his own magistrates. There is no reason to suppose with Onkelos that a direct reference to Samson is intended; the

tribe in general seems to be thus characterized. So also in the next verse, the craft of the Danites and their destruction of their enemies, are expressed by the metaphor of a serpent lying in the path, striking with its poisonous fang the heel of the unsuspecting horse, and causing him, through the pain occasioned by the bite, to throw his rider in the dust. Comp. Judg. xviii. 27, 28. The Septuagint renders שִׁפְיָן by ἐγχαΐμενος.

18. No view of this clause seems more probable than that suggested by Herder and adopted by Dathe. The patriarch, while he is uttering these predictions respecting the character and situation of the tribe of Dan, recollects with feelings of devout gratitude the many difficulties and concealed dangers from which the Almighty had delivered him, and expresses his confidence in the divine protection, in the deliverance of his descendants from dangers and hostile attacks, and perhaps in the future spiritual deliverance which he had before predicted. The language is comprehensive, and admits of a wide application. The extraordinary goodness of God, which Jacob had so often experienced, was well adapted to give him composure and elevation of mind in his dying moments; and equally so to raise the hopes of his posterity under any trying circumstances in which they might afterwards be placed, and to keep alive their faith in the future coming of the great deliverer.

19. גַּד בְּדָרַךְ יִגְדָּכֶנּוּ וְהוּא יִגְדָּךְ עָקֵב. 'Gad—a troop may press upon him, but he shall press in the end.' Thus I have rendered עָקֵב, following Rosenmüller. He prefers this meaning on the authority of Aben Ezra, whose interpretation is וְהוּא יִנְצַחֵנוּ בְּאַחֲרוֹנָה, 'but he shall overcome it in the end,' or 'afterwards;' and the Arabic of Erpenius. Dathe and Gesenius think it means 'the rear,' and the latter refers to Josh. viii. 13. This signification has the support of the Arabic of Saadias. The sense will then be, that God

shall put his foes to flight, and drive them before him; or else, that, although his enemies may press him, he shall rout their rear. It is not easy to say which of the two interpretations is correct; the former is perhaps the more probable. The paronomasia which runs through the verse is very striking, and בְּרָכָה seems to have been selected on account of its alliteration with בָּרָךְ , not that the words are synonymous, for the latter, as was before remarked, signifies ‘good luck.’ בְּרָכָה , which is translated “troop,” does not appear to mean an army fully supplied and properly drawn up, but rather a band of warriors accustomed to predatory incursions. See 2 Kings, v. 2; Hos. vii. 1. The Septuagint version is: $\Gamma\acute{\alpha}\delta, \pi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma \pi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu, \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \delta\epsilon \pi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \pi\acute{\omicron}\delta\alpha\varsigma$, where $\pi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is used for a band of robbers, $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\zeta\eta\mu\alpha \lambda\eta\sigma\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$, as Hippolytus explains it. See Schleusner’s Thesaurus in verb. and Rosenmüller in loc. SCHNEIDER and PASSOW, in their Greek Lexicons, give the sense of a company of pirates, and the former refers to Heliodorus in defence of this meaning.

20. This verse expresses nothing more than the fertility of Asher’s soil and the abundance and excellence of its productions. Compare Deut. xxxiii. 24.

21. : $\text{נִפְתָּלִי אֵילָנָה שְׁלֵתָהּ הַנֶּחֱלָה אֶמְרֵי-יִשְׁשָׁר$. ‘Naphthali is a hind let loose; he giveth discourses of beauty.’ Bochart, in his Hierozoicon, P. I. Lib. III. cap. 18, p. 896, proposed another interpretation of this verse, and it has been adopted by several modern critics, among whom are Dathe and De Wette. His version is this: ‘Naphthali is a spreading tree, (or terebinth,) which puts forth beautiful branches.’ The metaphor, as denoting prosperity in general, is too frequent to require illustration. This translation is favored by the parallelism, and has the sanction of the Septuagint version: $\text{Νεφθαλι στέλσχος ἀνεμμένον, ἐπιτοῖός ἐν τῷ γεννήματι κάλλος}$. It requires us to read אֵילָנָה , (the *Jod* may be retained, as in

the plural נַפְתָּלִים, Isa. i. 29, although the common form of the singular is נַפְתָּלִי) or the construct נַפְתָּלִי, and to alter the punctuation of נַפְתָּלִי so as to read נַפְתָּלִי. The meaning, as exhibited by the present Rabbinical punctuation, is given in the English translation: "Naphthali is a hind let loose; he giveth goodly words." Robertson, in his *Clavis Pentateuchi*, who adheres to this interpretation, remarks, that this tribe may be compared to a hind on account of its extraordinary increase, and its situation in rocky, mountainous districts. Whether the descendants of Naphthali were so numerous as to sanction his first observation, may be doubted. Certainly Deut. xxxiii. 23, to which he appeals, is of too general a nature to justify such a representation; and although, as he says, the country about Gallilee was exceedingly populous, so also, it may be replied, was the whole country of Palestine. See Num. i. 42, 43, from which, in connexion with the rest of the chapter, it does not appear that this tribe was particularly numerous in comparison with the others. If this meaning be the correct one, I should rather think that the stateliness and beauty of the gazelle, so celebrated among the eastern poets, constitute the point of comparison. The prediction will then be, that Naphthali shall be a noble and lovely tribe among the others, a race of princes worthy of being celebrated. This coincides with the sentiment expressed in the next clause, which is not very intelligible in the common version, and which is well explained by the same author thus: "he affords materials for joyful hymns." נַפְתָּלִי, which properly means 'word, discourse,' may express the subject of such discourse, whether it be poetic or not; as in Job xxxv. 10, the term "songs" is equivalent to 'subjects to sing of;' and in Ps. lxxix. 13, (12,) "I was the song of the drunkards," means, I was the subject of their idle mirth. According to this view of the passage, the

figure is of the same class as those used of Judah and Issachar. According to Bochart's interpretation, it is of the same kind as that under which Joseph is represented in the following verses, and it is beautifully sustained in the latter hemistich. But as his version requires a change of the punctuation, and assigns to the word אֲנִיר a meaning which is not sufficiently supported by the only two places in which אֲנִיר occurs. (Isa. xvii. 6, 9,) I thought it best to retain the old translation. The objection which has been urged, that the latter part of the verse is not in keeping with the figure contained in the former, is at best only rhetorical. The author may leave the metaphor with which he began, and speak of the tribe itself. It is not uncommon for one member of a parallelism to consist of figurative language, and another of proper terms. All the most important views of this passage may be found in Rosenmüller's note.

22. בֶּן פֶּרֶת יוֹסֵף בֶּן פֶּרֶת זָלִי-צֶן בְּנוֹת זָזָה : זָלִי-טוֹר :
 'A fruitful scion is Joseph, a fruitful scion at a well, the branches shoot over the wall.' The Hebrew is literally, 'a son of a fruitful (tree),' or, 'a son of a branch;' and is so rendered by De Wette: "Sohn eines fruchtbaren Baums." The phraseology is evidently in the usual style of Hebrew poetry, and I should prefer retaining it, were it not for the word בָּנוֹת in the next hemistich, which ought then to be translated 'daughters.' But this would not be allowable in our language, even in poetry, and the writer just mentioned renders it "Sprossen, sprouts, branches." Jacob begins the blessing of Joseph in language which alludes to the signification of his name, viz. 'addition, increase.' See Gen. xxx. 24. He compares his son to a branch, or scion, or tree, growing alongside of a well or fountain, and putting forth new and plentiful shoots. Dathe supposes פֶּרֶת to be used for זָאֵה, (the quiescent א

being omitted.) ‘a branch.’ See Ezek. xvii. 6, xxxi. 5, 6, 12. Rosenmüller explains the masculine **בֵּן** by ramus, and says that it is connected with the feminine adjective **פְּרִיָּה**, in consequence of the meaning of the synonymous term **פְּרִיָּה**. The grammatical construction, he remarks, suits the sense, not the word, as in Judg. xviii. 7, where **וְהָעָם** is connected with **וְיִשְׁכְּבֶתָהּ**, because it expresses the idea of society, **הַבְּרִיָּה**. His translation is: “filius fructifer, a fruit-bearing son is Joseph, &c.” Such usage is not at all uncommon, but whether it is necessary to resort to it in the present instance is far from being certain. **פְּרִיָּה** may be used as the participle for **פְּרִיָּה** or **פְּרִיָּה**, ‘fruit-bearing, fruitful,’ as Kimchi has remarked. See Buxtorf’s Thes. Gram. Lib. I. cap. 49. p. 265, Basil edition, 1629. The clause will then stand thus: ‘a son of a fruitful,’ (meaning tree or vine, or something equivalent,) or else, (taking ‘fruitful’ as the concrete for the abstract,) ‘a son of fertility,’ that is, by a common Hebraism, ‘an abundantly fruitful plant or branch is Joseph.’ Rosenmüller objects, that if it be taken in the construct state it ought to be **בֵּן**, with a sǽgol, but this only shows that the Masorets did not understand it in the construct; and how easily the lower dot of the sǽgol might be obliterated in some manuscript, needs no proof. **בְּנֵיהֶם** literally means ‘daughters,’ as the branches of the growing scion, the **בֵּן** of the former clause, are elegantly denominated; or, if the author has the vine in view, its tendrils, creeping up the walls. The vine is used as an image of fecundity. See Ps. cxxviii. 3. The plural is joined to the singular verb **וַיִּצְמַח** distributively, as if it had been said, *each one* shoots over.—The Septuagint version of this verse is as follows: Ὁ υἱὸς ἡυξήμενος ἰωσήφ, υἱὸς ἡυξήμενος μὲν ζήλωντος, υἱὸς μὲν νεώτατος πρὸς μὲν ἀνάσπρεπον. It is

plain, that the translators used a copy with a different reading from the present Masoretical. See Schleusner, *ubi sup.* under $\xi\eta\lambda\omega\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\nu\epsilon\acute{\omega}\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$. In part, the Septuagint coincides with the Samaritan. See Dathe's note.

23. The meaning of this verse is very clear. It refers to the animosity which Joseph's brethren had cherished, and the hostile conduct which they had pursued towards him. The figure is changed, and they are represented as archers shooting at their enemy with the fixed purpose of destroying him. For the meaning of רָבִי, see Rosenmüller in *loc.*

24. וַתֵּשֶׁב בְּאַיֶתֶן קִשְׁתּוֹ. 'But his bow continued strong; literally, in strength, the adjective אֵיֶתֶן being used as a noun.'—וַיִּפְנֶה זְרָעִי יָדָיו, 'and his arms were active.' Rosenmüller considers זְרָעִי יָדָיו as equivalent to זְרָעִי, *his arms*, the latter word being redundant. Others suppose זְרָעִי to be used figuratively for *might*. Thus Gesenius: "the power (might) of his hands." But in all the instances cited by him, except Job xxii. 9, Ps. xxxvii. 17, and Dan. xi. 15, 22, 31, the word is singular, and it is this form which is usually employed in this metaphorical sense, and therefore I have preferred following Rosenmüller. Perhaps too it may be worth noting, that in the excepted places more than one individual, a class of persons, is referred to. The word פָּזַז occurs also in 2 Sam. vi. 16, and in both these places seems to convey the idea of the cognate Arabic word, فَازَ, 'to be light, nimble, active.' See Dathe in *loc.* and Schultens' *Opera Minora*, p. 132—135. מִיָּדֵי אַבְרָם : וַעֲקֹב מִשְׁם רֶעֶה אָבִן יִשְׂרָאֵל. 'By the hands of the mighty one of Jacob, by the power (name) of the shepherd, the stone (rock) of Israel.' There is great difficulty in settling the connexion and meaning of this and the following

clauses. De Wette completes a period with וְיָיָא , (which is sanctioned by the accent Athnach,) and translates the remainder of this verse, and the twenty-fifth, thus :

Aus der Hand des gewaltigen Jakobs,
 Vom Führer, vom Felsen Israels,
 25. Vom Gott deines Vaters, er half dir,
 Vom Allmächtigen, er segnete dich,
 Komme dir Segen des Himmels von obenher,
 Segen der Tiefe unten,
 Segen der Brüste und des Mutterleibs !

By the hand of the powerful Jacob,
 From the leader, from the rock of Israel,
 25. From the God of thy father, he helped thee,
 From the Almighty, he blessed thee,
 Come to thee blessings of the heaven from above,
 Blessings of the deep below,
 Blessings of the breasts and of the womb !

Dathe connects the remainder of the twenty-fourth verse with the preceding clause, and for מִשָּׁם , 'from thence,' he would read מִשְׁמֵי , 'from the name,' corresponding with וְיָיָא , and supported by the Syriac version, ܡܝܢܐ ܕܝܝܐ . He supposes the patriarch to refer to the history in Gen. xxviii. 12, 13, the occasion of his distress, when God gave him the most ample promises. His version is this :—"by the help of the mighty God, whom Jacob worshipped, by him who guarded the stone of Israel." In a note he adds as follows : "It appears to me that the narrative in Gen. xxviii. 12, 13, suggests a simple and natural exposition of this verse. At a time when Jacob very greatly needed the divine assistance, God granted him most ample promises,

while asleep with a stone for his pillow. Therefore, says he, the same God, who was present with me in the most dangerous period of my life, hath also defended thee in thy calamities. Thus he explains himself in the next verse.” —Rosenmüller, who gives the same view of the passage from TELLER’S, *Not. Crit.*, remarks, that there is considerable harshness in speaking of God as the shepherd or defender of a stone. He supposes Joseph to be intended by these expressions, and retains the reading **שֵׁן**, which he interprets by, ‘from that time,’ which is, to say the least, a very doubtful meaning of the word. See Note 15. p. 179, 180. *Inde pascens erat et lapis Israelis*; ‘from the time that he escaped the difficulties which had oppressed him, he sustained myself and family.’ Jacob calls his son ‘the shepherd’ of Israel, because he had supplied the wants of his household and raised them to affluence, and ‘the stone,’ because he had been their prop and support.—I do not see any more harshness in representing God as the protector of Jacob’s stone than there is in speaking of him as the “keeper of the city.” Ps. xxxvii. 1. If there were, it would be removed by the expository translation of Herder, “who watched Israel on his stone: Von Namen dess, der Israel auf seinem Stein bewachte.” *Letters on the Study of Theology*, (Briefe, &c.) p. 76. Amidst so much uncertainty it is difficult to come to any satisfactory and certain result. In the version above offered, I have adopted the reading **שֵׁן**, retaining its common translation “name,” which must be considered as conveying also the idea of power, a meaning which is undoubtedly implied in the word, and which corresponds with the parallel **יָד**. It seems most probable, too, from the use of the preposition **בְּ** prefixed to both these words, in connexion with the parallelism of the clauses, that both relate to the same object. The word **רֶזֶה** is

beautifully applied to God as the patriarch's kind and tender protector, (see Ps. xxiii. 1.) and there is no difficulty in considering אֲבִיךָ as in opposition with it, and expressive of almighty support, in which sense the corresponding term צוּר, 'rock,' is often employed.

25. 'By the God of thy father, who will help thee, and by the Almighty, who will bless thee with blessings of heaven above, blessings of the deep which lieth below, blessings of the breasts and of the womb.'—Some commentators suppose an ellipsis immediately after the words "who will bless thee," which they supply with 'be thou blessed,' or 'let them come,' as may suit the language of the context. But if the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses be connected, as in the translation of the analysis, which gives to the preposition מִן before מִיְּדֵי שָׁם (שָׁם,) and אֵל the same general meaning, and making the three nouns relate to the same being, the necessity of adding any thing to the text is removed. In וַיְבָרֶכֶּה וַיְשַׁבְּרֶה the vau expresses the sense of אֲשֶׁר, *who*. וְהָיוּ רַגְלָיִךָ תַּחַת הָאֲרֶזֶם is rendered by Dathe *terræ ei* (that is, *cælo*), *subjectæ*. But הָאֲרֶזֶם does not appear to be used in this sense. The common phrase for 'earth below,' when antithetic to 'heaven above,' is אֲרֶזֶם מִתַּחַת. See Exod. xx. 4. Deut. iv. 39, v. 8. As "blessings of heaven above" refers to seasonable rains and copious dews, moistening and fertilizing the ground, and preparing it to yield plentiful harvests, so it would seem that "blessings of the deep that lieth below," must be intended to express fountains, lakes and streams of water, which promote fertility and conduce to the agreeableness and advantages of a country. The last clause plainly denotes a strong and numerous posterity. Compare the imprecatory language in Hos. ix. 14.

26. בְּרָכַת אָבִיךָ גְּבֹרָה עַל-בְּרָכַת הָאָבִי עַד תֵּאָמַר גְּבֹרָה : עוֹלָם : 'The blessings of thy father exceed the blessings

of the everlasting mountains, the desirable things of the eternal hills.'—For הָרִי the Samaritan Pentateuch has הָרִי, 'mountains,' which is probably the true reading, or else הָרִי הָר, being considered as an old form of הָר,* in either case עַד being connected with it, and not disjoined as in the Rabbinical text by the Sakeph katon. This appears to have been the reading from which the Septuagint version was made: ὑπὲρ ἐὺλογίας ὀρεῶν μονίμων, καὶ ἐπ' ἐὺλογίαις διενῶν ἀενάων. It is supported by the corresponding word גְּבֻעַת in the parallel hemistich, and the meaning thus obtained, which I have expressed in the translation, is preferred by several modern critics, among whom may be found the names of De Wette, Dathe and Gesenius. This reading is also confirmed by the parallel place in Deut. xxxiii. 15, וַמְרֹאֶשׁ וּמִצֵּי הָרִי-קָדִים—“ancient mountains”—and the other in Hab. iii. 6, וַתִּלְפָּצֵי הָרִי-עַד שְׁהִי גְבֻעַת—“everlasting mountains.” Rosenmüller, who prefers retaining the usual punctuation, remarks, that “although הָרָה properly means, ‘to conceive, to be pregnant,’ yet, like יָלַד, it is used indifferently of father or mother, so that הָרִי is properly, what gives conception, father.” But he produces no evidence in support of his assertion, and Dathe states, “that הָרָה is always used of the female, never of the male,” which I believe is true, except in cases where the word is applied figuratively. Rosenmüller says indeed, that, although the data by which the other view is supported are specious, the result to which it leads is inelegant and far-fetched; nor is it easy to perceive, why eternity should be repeated, that is, predicated both of mountains

* Gesenius, Geschichte der Heb. Spr. und Schrift, § 56. p. 119, and Lexicon under הָרִי 1.

and hills. To prove that the result is as he states, would be difficult; and the latter remark certainly needs no reply, as the application of the term *eternal* or *everlasting* to the mountains and hills, is plainly intended to increase the poetic effect, and to make the parallelism more perfect.—The meaning appears to be this: ‘the blessings which thy father invokes on thee are superior to the blessings, (the best productions,) of the perpetual mountains, the most desirable gifts of the eternal hills;’ in other words, they are the most excellent that paternal affection can pray for.—The other translation, “the blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors,” conveys a sense which is not very probable. The patriarch would hardly announce the magnificence of his own prophetic benediction by contrasting it with those of his venerated ancestors, neither indeed can it be said, in reference to Joseph, that the blessings promised him are superior to those which had been made to Jacob himself, (see Gen. xxvii. 28, 29. xxiii. 3, 4.) to say nothing of the glorious promises both of a temporal and spiritual kind which God had given to Abraham.—If the word בְּרִכָּה be derived from בָּרַךְ, equivalent to בָּרַךְ, ‘to mark out,’ it may be translated ‘bound,’ as it is in our English version, founded on some ancient Jewish authorities; but its usual meaning is ‘delight, desire, object of desire.’—There is no difficulty in the remainder of the verse, unless it be in the word נָזִיר. It is derived from נָזַר, ‘to separate, distinguish,’ namely, for excellencies and dignity. If, with many late critics, we consider it as a denominative from קִנֵּי, ‘a crown, a diadem,’ it will be equivalent to, *he that wears the crown*, in other words, *the prince, the noblest among his brethren*. The general idea is the same as that just stated. The same phrase נָזִיר אֱלֹהִים in Deut. xxxiii. 16, is translated in the Septuagint version ὁ ἑξουσιεὺς ἐν ἀνελφεῖς, and this

is the meaning which is given here by the Targum of Jonathan: **רַב וְשֵׁלִיט בְּמִצְרַיִם וְזָהִיר בִּיקָרָא דְאַחָרַי**, 'who was prince and ruler in Egypt, and distinguished (literally, *shining, splendid*;) by honor of his brethren,' that is, by the respect which his brothers paid him. See Rosenmüller in loc. The same idea of superior dignity is conveyed also by the Syriac version, **ܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠܐ ܕܪܥܝܐ**; **ܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠܐ ܕܪܥܝܐ**, 'upon the head of the diadem,' that is, the head of him who was honored with the diadem, the abstract being used, most probably, for the concrete. The Septuagint, in making Joseph the ruler over his brethren agrees in this meaning, **ὡν ἡγῆσατο ἀδελφῶν**.*

27. 'Benjamin is a wolf, he tears in pieces: in the morning he devours the prey, and at evening he divides the spoil.' This verse describes the warlike disposition of the tribe, and the rapacity with which they would spoil their enemies. Some have supposed the meaning to be, that the booty obtained would be so immense as to be sufficient for Benjamin's consumption not only in the morning, but through the whole day, even until the evening, and also for the consumption of others. Some again understand it thus, that the booty, which he had divided at evening, should be abundantly sufficient to last until the morning. See Rosenmüller in loc. Probably, however, nothing more is intended than this, that both morning and evening, day and night, in other words, at all times, he will be dividing the booty or devouring the prey. Rapacity and destructiveness could scarcely be expressed in bolder and more graphical poetry.

* It may not be unworthy of remark, that SCHILLER in some of his tragedies uses the same figure. Thus, in his WILLIAM TELL, act iii. scene 2, Rudenz says to Bertha: Da seh' ich Dich, die *Krone* aller Frauen. And in the MAID OF ORLEANS, act i. scene 4, Charles applies the same term to Agnes Sorel.

(165.) This is doubtless the true meaning of the phrase **מֵעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן** in this place, and most probably it should always be rendered ‘beyond,’ or ‘on the other side of the Jordan,’ wherever it occurs; although it is maintained by some commentators and critics, that it means ‘on this or on that side indifferently,’ and in our English translation it is sometimes rendered “on this side,” and sometimes “beyond Jordan.” See Hengstenberg’s examination of this phrase, *ubi sup.* II. p. 313—324.—The cavalcade that attended the remains of Jacob was probably accompanied by some military force, to protect it from hostile bands. See v. 9. Avoiding a march into Canaan by the most direct course, perhaps from motives of a prudential kind, the company proceeded along its southern border to the eastern extremity, where, after the second mourning was finished, they crossed to the western bank of the Jordan, and, unattended probably by the armed force, proceeded to the place of interment. The country beyond Jordan is clearly contradistinguished from “the land of Canaan” in v. 13. So also in Num. xxxii. 32: “we will pass over armed into *the land of Canaan*, that the possession of our inheritance *beyond the Jordan* may be ours;” that is, as is proved by the twenty-ninth and thirty-third verses, the country lying east of the Jordan: and xxxv. 14: “ye shall give three cities *beyond the Jordan*, and three cities shall ye give in *the land of Canaan*.” In these two last places, our translation has “on this side Jordan;” but in both, the original phrase is **מֵעֵבֶר לַיַּרְדֵּן**. In Num. xxxii. 19, the use of the term is very remarkable. The Reubenites and Gadites, who settled on the east of Jordan, say to Moses: “we will not inherit with them,” (the other tribes,) “*beyond the Jordan and forward*, **מֵעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן וְהַלְּאָה**, because our inheritance is fallen to us *beyond the Jordan eastward*, **מֵעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן מִזְרָחָהּ**.” It is not to be supposed that the

same phrase is employed in opposite senses in such a connexion, although such seems to have been the opinion of the English translator of the book, who, in the former case, renders it "on yonder side," and in the latter, "on this side." The phrase signifies *beyond the Jordan* in both cases, and the word added in each shows the reader which side is meant. The opinion of Gesenius, under עֵבֶר, 1. (Robinson's Translation, p. 734,) that "this expression is (sometimes) applied to the country west of the Jordan, *by a later idiom, it would seem, which probably arose during the Babylonian exile,*" is unfounded in fact and not necessary to illustrate the texts. The truth seems to be, that the phrase had a definite, geographical sense, designating the country lying east of the Jordan, similar to the use of *transalpine Gaul* among the Romans; and was also used to denote the region on the side of the river opposite to that occupied by the writer, or the possession of which he regarded at the time of writing as having been already entirely secured by conquest. If so, the word will always retain one uniform meaning, although it may be employed, according to circumstances, to designate the territory lying on either side of the river.

F I N I S .

16711TC 736

08-07-03 32180

MS



Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01276 7358

